Speeches.

OF

Srj. BEPIN CHANDRA PAL

(Delivered at MADRAS.)

PUBLISHED

BY

GANESH & Co., MADRAS.

PRINTED AT THE IRISH PRESS,

MADRAS :

1907.

SPEECHES OF BABU BEPIN CHANDRA PAL.
DELIVERED IN MADRAS.

The first of the series of speeches delivered in Madras by Babu Bepin Chandra Pal was on the "New Movement." Mr. G. Subramania Iyer, B.A., Editor of the Swadesa-Mithran, was voted to the chair

The New Movement.

Mr. Subramania Aiyar, friends and fellow-countrymen :—When at the close of the last Session of the Indian National Congress in Calcutta, I was asked to go over here on a short lecturing tour, and when in response to that kind invitation I agreed to do so, I did not expect the demonstration that I witnessed last evening while progressing along with you in a procession. I refuse to accept it as a procession organized in my honour and, therefore, I say I was not prepared for the demonstration that I saw last evening. It was not in honour of any particular individual, but of the ideals of *Swadeshi* and *Swaraj* (Cries of Vande Mataram), to which reference has already been made by my friend in the chair. Nor did I expect such a large gathering as I see before me. I was fortunate enough to address very large audiences in Madras on previous occasions, but this audience, I am called upon to face this evening, is absolutely out of all proportion to what experience I had even in your enthusiastic city, 4 or 5 years ago. This is a proof, Sir, I take it, not merely of the idle curiosity of the people of this great city, (cries of 'certainly not'), but I take it—and I am glad of that assurance—that it is a proof at least

of the interest that has been awakened among my countrymen here in the New Movement, that has already commenced to bring about mighty transformations in the thoughts and ideals of our countrymen all over this great Indian continent (Hear, hear). What is this New Movement? You read in the newspapers the outer manifestations of this movement. You have come to identify this movement with Swadeshi; you have come to identify this movement with something more than Lord Minto's honest 'Swadesi'; you have come to identify it with Swadesi that is organically related to boycott (Hear, hear); you have come to identify this movement with the new ideal of *swaraj*; you have come to identify this movement also, as your chairman told you, with the Partition of Bengal (Hear, hear). You see ripples of this movement in the outbreak of lawlessness in the Eastern Provinces, first in the outbreak of lawlessness by those who are paid by the people of this country (hear, hear and cries of shame) to help in the preservation of law and order (cries of shame). You saw the ripple of this new movement in the kind of lawlessness last year about this time in Barisal (cries of shame). You, I believe, recognised also the outer ripples of this movement in the present outburst of lawlessness in another shape viz, in the outburst of Mahomedan *Vandalism* in parts of East Bengal You have come to identify this movement with the incarceration of our young men and old men also, with the arrests of popular leaders (cries of shame) in different parts of Bengal. You have come to identify it with the regulation sticks of the Police and the *Vande Mataram* sticks of the people. I know all this; and you also know all these things. But I do not care just now to speak of these outer ripples. They are merely the manifestations of a force that is flowing through the very heart of the nation. They are the outermost fringe, as it were, the outermost

course of the mighty currents that have commenced to stir to their very depths the still waters of Indian national life Sometime ago, an English gentleman, a retired Anglo-Indian official, wrote to a friend of mine in Calcutta, wanting to know the inwardness of the New Movement in Bengal. I desire to speak a few words to you this evening on this inwardness of the New Movement.

What is this movement due to ? What are the forces of its strength and inspiration ? What are the forces that lie hidden at the root of this movement ? What is it that this movement desires to achieve and how does it propose to achieve that end? Reference, gentlemen, has been made to the Partition of Bengal. Allow me to tell you that the significance of that measure has been considerably exaggerated outside Bengal. It has been, I confess, exaggerated also to some extent even by a section of the Bengali Press. The Partition was an evil measure, the Partition was a hateful measure. The Bengalis hated to be divided from their own people, the Eastern Provinces from the Western Provinces. We have been living together for how many centuries past nobody knows; we have developed a peculiar culture of our own, through a common language and a common literature. Belonging though, no doubt, to the *wide* life of Indian Hindus and Indian Moslems, yet Bengal Hinduism has its own peculiarity, as the Moslem ideals and cultures of Bengal have also their own peculiarity. Bengal has been for many centuries past a nation speaking one language, belonging to one civilization, practically trying to develop one culture, and this original unity based upon the unity of language, religion, civilization and culture, developed and grew—thank God—under the community of civic and political interests. Ever since the establishment of British rule in India, we had been

governed practically by one and the same laws, ruled by the same administration; and our political life has, all these years, been controlled by one single policy. Suddenly, however, the Province, united in language, united in past historic associations, united in civilization and culture, united in a common law and administration, this Province was proposed to be cut into two, which gave offence to us. It pained us. We cried, we prayed, we petitioned, we protested, but all to no purpose (cries of shame) and the administrative will—I will not call it administrative necessity, because we do not recognise the necessity—the administrative will had its way. And on the 16th October 1905, two Provinces were made out of the Province of Bengal. The measure was carried out with almost indecent haste, and the reason of the haste was this—judging from the past experience of Indian political life and agitation, the Government of Lord Curzon evidently believed (cries of shame) that as long as the measure was not carried out, so long only would this agitation continue. But once it became a "Settled fact," the agitation also would quietly, like all previous agitations, more or less settle down. That was the prognosis which the acute Viceroy made of the situation. For once, superior wisdom was blinded, superior intelligence failed to see through the outer garb and gathering of popular agitation and popular excitement (cries of shame and cheers); and the agitation against Partition instead of subsiding, as previous agitations had done, when it was found that they would do no good, continued; it increased, it expanded, it attacked and covered new grounds. It developed new forces and it applied these new forces to the solution of the problem before itself. (Hear, hear) Whence came this new inspiration, this new force? Truth to say, we soon recognised that it is not in the power of any Government, much less is it in the power

of an alien Government, to divide a people whom Gods united (Hear, hear). They might with their pen, dipped in red ink, pass a line on the administrative map of the Province (Hear, hear), add fresh labours to the draftsmen in the Survey Department of the Government. But the stroke of the pen, cannot cut the nation into two. The stroke of the pen though it wounds, wounds in other ways than by cutting things into two's and three's twenty's and thirty's. If it were possible for a stroke of the pen to cut up anything, why, we have been applying this stroke, my friend in the chair and I, a humble follower of his (cheers). We have been cutting administrations not into two, but into two hundreds almost every day by the stroke of our pens; but the administration remains all the same. We pierce officials by this instrument, but the officials remain all the time hale and hearty. So that when Lord Curzon passed his gubernatorial pen, cut the Province of Bengal in twain, Bengal remained one, and all that this attempt did was to create a deathless determination in the people to continue to be one to the end of their life (Hear, hear). So, really, the Partition measure failed, and the failure of it was confirmed by the proceedings of the public meeting that we held in Calcutta, on the 7th August 1905. I was addressing an overflowing meeting on that memorable evening from the steps of the Calcutta Town Hall. The audience was as large as this, and when I saw that audience, the idea struck me that it would be a very good thing if the Viceroy's astral body could descend from Simla and take its position on the top of the banyan tree, that we have near our Town Hall, and if it could see from the top of that tree the crowds that gathered and declared their determination to undo the measures of the Partition measure. If he could have seen it, he might have known and understood from ocular evidence how Bengal was being

partitioned by him. No, gentlemen, "the partition has failed." Mr. Morley says, it is a settled fact. (Cries of shame). History declares that it is a settled failure (cheers), and I think settled failure is as good an expression as "settled fact" (Hear, hear). Now, the Partition has failed, and we do not care whether the Partition goes or whether it remains. Why, because in our eagerness to undo this partition, in the agony of our heart, as our protests, our prayers, our petitions failed to move the obdurate heart of those who are placed over us to govern us and to rule us, in the agony of despair we looked about and found nothing on which we could lean. All was dark, our faith in all the professions had already commenced to wane long before the Partition measure was broached. Our faith in the generosity and the justice of the British policy had commenced to wane before the Partition measure commenced. Lord Curzon—God bless him—(cheers and laughter). I say it sincerely, God bless him (renewed laughter), because, to my mind, Sir, India has not had a more 'beneficent' Viceroy than Lord Curzon (Hear, hear) Lord Ripon was kind. Lord Ripon (cheers) was considerate. Lord Ripon was good. He was tender-hearted, but Lord Ripon's rule was not so beneficent to India as Lord Curzon's has been. Lord Ripon was like a kind mother, and there are circumstances in the life of a child when a good mother becomes a bad mother, when a kind mother works more mischief than a hating step-mother might have done. Lord Ripon was a kind Viceroy, but Lord Curzon was a beneficent Viceroy. But whether he wished it or not, that is another question. That is not a question that need trouble you. Let the English people judge it. Let them consider in the light of their own interests the Viceroyalty of Lord Curzon; but applying our standard of judgment to that Viceroyalty, I do not hesitate to say that it

has been one of the most beneficent, if not decidedly the most beneficent, Viceroyalty that India ever had (cries of no, no.) We had been brought up, Sir, for too long a period, upon political lollipops. We had been given for too long a period the beautiful and charming baby-comforter to keep ourselves quiet. Lord Ripon had done it. Others would do it again. But, God be thanked, Lord Curzon threw the baby-comforter away, and by throwing it away he made us feel the hunger that is in us, the hunger for *Swaraj* (Hear, hear), the hunger for political autonomy, the hunger for occupying our definitely appointed place in the council of nations (Hear, hear), the hunger for entering upon our own rights in the universal life of humanity, with a view to deepen, to broaden, to quicken that life by the provisions of our special culture, civilization and ideals (Hear, hear). This is the work that God has done and he chose, in the mysteriousness of his Providence, Lord Curzon as the main instrument for doing this work. Let us thank God for Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty, and let us hope and trust that Lord Curzon will live long and enjoy health, and be the Premier of England when India will place before him the ultimatum. (Shouts of Vande-Mataram). That will be the fitting end of the drama of which the first act only has been played by that capable Viceroy.

Gentlemen, Lord Curzon did this good. He awakened the dormant consciousness of the nation, but he did not create it. The consciousness was there. It lay latent, it flowed as an undercurrent, and recent movements only helped to bring the latent forces in the nation to the surface. What was the preparation for this New Movement? When we call anything new, we do not mean to say that it has no relation to things that can be described as old. New and old are only comparative terms.

What was new in 1887 becomes old in 1907. That is all the difference and you must recognize that difference, when talking and thinking about the New Movement, the new thought, ideal or the new methods. There is an evolution, there has been an evolution in the history of Indian Politics also. I remember the first time that I appeared upon a public platform in your city was in 1887. when you had the first Congress here. I miss now some kindly faces whom I first came to know in 1887 ; and when I appeared for the first time on the platform of the Congress in 1887, in the course of what may be called, so far as Congress platforms are concerned, my maiden speech, I declared that I was a democrat, a democrat of democrats, a radical of radicals; yet I said that neither my democracy nor my radicalism took away in the least measure from my loyalty to the British Government (Hear, hear.) That was in 1887 and I said it in all sincerity and earnestness. I do not believe that diplomacy is needed or suited to a subject nation My friend, Mr. Choudry, had declared sometime ago that a subject nation has no politics. By politics I can only mean one thing and that thing is not diplomacy. Diplomacy is concealment of ideas and purpose, concealment of sentiments and opinions, that is necessary in negotiations between one powerful State and another. It is not necessary between a subject people and its Government, unless that subject people are viciously inclined and desire to bring about a rebellion before the time is ripe for it. In that case, diplomacy may be held good ; but, I do not believe, I say, in diplomacy in subject-peoples. A subject-people must have its politics, but a subject-people cannot have any diplomacy and when I said that my democracy and my imperialism combined together to make me immensely loyal to the British Government, I said what I believed to be true then and I said what numbers

of my educated countrymen belonging to that generation absolutely believed to be true. In those days, we had faith in the British nation. We had been brought up with the idea that our salvation and even our political salvation would come from England. We believed in those days that England's mission in India was a conscientiously divine mission. I believe it is a divine mission, but I would qualify that old statement by deleting the word 'conscientiously' from it now. But in 1887 we all believed that England was conscientiously and deliberately working for the political emancipation of India. We believed that she would take us up by the hand and gradually set us in our own proper place among the nations of the world. We believed that by the gradual expansion of the principles and organization of self-Government that had been introduced by Lord Ripon, by the reform and expansion of Legislative Councils, by the introduction of a large number of people of this country into our Public Service, by opening to us the gates of the military services, by granting us the charter of free citizenship and investing us with the right of organizing national militia. We hoped, we believed in 1887, that by these means England would gradually train us to become a free nation and take up our place among the free states of the world; and we believed what Lord Macaulay had said many years ago, that if such a day came when the people of India, trained and educated by England in the arts, the sciences, the philosophies and the ideals of the West, would demand the right to govern themselves, would desire to have the same free institutions, if such a day came, England would regard it as a most glorious day in its history. For, having found an ancient nation in the very depths of degradation, it took that nation up, gave out to that nation its own wisdom, its own inspiration, its own experience and its own strength, and set that

ancient nation once more upon the pedestal of free citizenship. That had been declared by Macaulay and the declaration in one form or other had been repeated by successive British statesmen here in this country and across the seas. We looked into these declarations. We accepted them as gospel truth and we believed that if really we depended on England for our political emancipation, followed her guidance, accepted her disciplines, placed ourselves in her hands for our training, then the day would come when under her guidance, with her help, we would be able to realise our highest, noblest and deepest political aspirations and be a free nation among the free nations of the world. (Cheers).

That was the faith that lived in us in the Eighties; that was the faith that quickened the activities of the Indian National Congress; that was the faith which governed all our political agitations in the past. I put it to you; have you that faith to-day ? (cries of no, no). You need not be afraid of saying that you have no faith. It is clear for the simple reason that Lord Curzon has distinctly stated that there is no ground for entertaining such a faith any more. That declaration, which gave us a greater charter than the Queen's Proclamation itself, is this. (cheers). I will just refresh your memory. Speaking on the Budget, it was, I believe, in his Lordship's last but one Budget speech, he said that we had misread and misunderstood the Queen's Proclamation. We had been preserving it as our Magna Charta. It was a foolish fancy. Sir, Magna Charta has a peculiar history of its own. Magna Charta was signed under peculiarly complex circumstances, and in the absence of these circumstances, in the absence of these active political forces that begot the Magna Charta, (Hear, hear) in the absence of King John, in the absence of Runnymeade, in the

absence of the armed barons, in the absence of the pitiable condition of the English King, there could be no Magna Charta. It should be some other Charta, but it would not be Magna Charta. But still, we had looked upon it as our Magna Charta—it was the custom in those days to think of every thing Indian in the terms of English life. If there was a great man among us, say Kalidasa, &c, whoever he might be, he must be either a Shakespeare or Milton or Byron or Shelley. If there be a philanthropist, he must be a Howard. He counts for nothing unless he is a Howard. That was the mental attitude of the Indian people then and, on account of this peculiar mental attitude we looked about for our political documents and found this precious document in the Queen's Proclamation. We called it the Magna Charta; that is the psychological explanation, not that our leaders did not know that the forces that created the Magna Charta were not present in India at the time of the Queen's Proclamation. Whatever that might be, we regarded it as our Magna Charta, and we based all our appeals to the Government upon that great Charter, and Lord Curzon thought that it was time to kill this foolish fancy and from his place in the Viceregal Council, he said that we did not read the Charter, read the Queen's Proclamation as carefully as we should have done. We would repeat it by heart (laughter) with all punctuations from beginning to end. Why, there is nothing in it that we have forgotten, nothing in it that we have omitted. What is the meaning, then, of this Viceregal declaration that we did not read the Magna Charta, we did not read the Queen's Proclamation? Lord Curzon did not keep us long in suspense, because in the very next sentence, he declared that we did not properly attend to the simple qualifying phrase "so far as it may be." We had known of this qualifying phrase, of this conditional clause, but we had interpreted it in our own

way, we had thought that this conditional clause had reference to our fitness, to our education, to our character and not to anything else. (Hear, hear) Lord Curzon said, "no—it has reference not to your education, fitness or character, but to the permanence of British overlordship in India" (cries of shame). "So far as it may be" means so far as is consistent with the preservation of the supreme authority of the British in this country. You may be qualified by education and character to manage your own affairs, you may be better qualified than those who are brought out from across the seas to manage or mismanage the British administration, but so long as the administration in India continued to be British, so long the direction of its affairs must necessarily rest with the British. Therefore, you would be given every opportunity of carrying out orders, but not to make one single order. You would be given every opportunity of working out the details, but no right to initiate reforms. What Lord Curzon said has been repeated by Lord Minto only two months back. In his Budget speech, what does Lord Minto say? He says that it is absolutely necessary that whatever reforms are introduced by the Government of India must be initiated by the Government itself; and it would be a mischievous thing for the British Government in India, if the idea got abroad that the Government of India had no conviction of their own, that they initiated reforms under pressure of public opinion here or under instructions from the people and the Government in England. That is what Lord Minto says, the same thing as Lord Curzon said. It means that the control of affairs, the direction of the administration, the right of initiative shall always be taken by the British people and their representatives here and not by any one else. It means, Sir, an open declaration by the present Viceroy that they are not amenable and they will never be amenable to Indian opinion in

those matters (cries of shame). What right have you to expect the British Government to do anything more than what they are doing? Would you do it, I ask you, if you were in their position (no, no)? Then do not cry shame. You regarded them at one time as more than human and little less, if less at all, than God. It was your folly if the disillusionment has come. Do not in the name of truth and justice think them to be more than human. They are men, they have not come here on an altruistic purpose, they have come here for the expansion of their trade, for the spread of their own empire, for the exploitation of the resources of the country and even the intellect of the land for the improvement of their wealth and intellect (cries of shame). Look facts in the face. Crying shame is a good sentiment, but it has a very bad reason. Now, Sir, Lord Minto has made this distinct declaration, that public opinion in India will not have any influence with the Government of this country so far as administration is concerned. For, reform must proceed from him. Any other source cannot but be a mischievous thing. Why mischievous, Sir? Why, because, if once you and I get the idea into our head that we can force the hands of the British Government in India, then after that what would you find but deluge? Then you will clamour for more, more, more, and more, until you have got the whole thing out of their hands. Therefore, Lord Minto warns you. They will do nothing simply because you want them to do it. They will do nothing under pressure of Indian opinion, and yet we have all these 25 years and more been dreaming of this one thing, namely, that, by the application of popular opinion to the problems of administration, by the creation of enlightened public opinion in India and by applying the force of that opinion upon the Government of this country and the British nation at Home, we would be able

to obtain every kind of political reform that we might demand. That has been our belief. That has been the one absolutely settled plan in the programme of the Congress. We have always believed in this, that the Government of India is amenable to Indian public opinion; if it has not been guided by Indian public opinion it is due to the fact that we have not been able to create a sufficiently strong public opinion. That has been our idea, Sir, but Lord Minto knocks that idea on the head at once and he says, "No, we shall not budge a fifth, a tenth, a hundredth or a millionth part of an inch. No pressure of Indian public opinion can influence Government." So Lord Minto paraphrases Lord Curzon's declarations and Lord Minto has the support of 'honest John' in this matter; because if Lord Minto's declaration is a paraphrase on the one hand of Lord Curzon's ancient dicta, then on the other hand the commentary is John Morley's statement, that "so far as my imagination reaches, so long the Government in India must be a personal and absolute Government." An absolute Government is that which refuses to be amenable to public opinion. An absolute Government is a new euphamism for despotic Government. An absolute Government is a despotic Government. A Despotic Government is that which is not amenable to public opinion. An absolute Government is that which does not agree to be guided and controlled by the opinions, ideals and sentiments of those whom it governs. It is a despotic Government, and what Lord Curzon had said some three or four years back, what Mr. John Morley declared last autumn, that is what Lord Minto has represented in other words and in another context in his last Budget speech; and yet this was not what we had been taught and trained to believe of the British Government in India. We had been trained to believe for the last 25 years, we have lived upon this one faith, that the

British Government in India is a constitutional Government. Is it, Sir, a constitutional Government ? My moderate friends still claim that it is a constitutional Government. They say that the British Government in India is a constitutional Government. There is some little confusion of thought in regard to this claim. Every Government must have a constitution of its own. There can be no Government without a constitution, because, if a Government had no constitution, there would be no continuity of purpose and policy. If a Government had no constitution, there would be nothing to regulate the parts to parts and the parts to the whole. A government, if it has nothing more, has at least an administrative machinery, and a machinery must have a constitution; though it be a mechanical constitution it must have a constitution of its own. Therefore, every Government has a constitution of its own. But every Government is not called in political science and in political history as a constitutional Government. Is it so ? The Government of the Czar has also a constitution of its own. Even the autocrat of all the Russias is bound by certain laws, certain precedents, certain customs, certain ideas and ideals, and therefore, there is a constitution in Russia. But whoever called the Government of the Czar a constitutional Government? Persia, Sir, had a constitution five years ago. If it had no constitution, Government would have been impossible in Persia, but still you say that the people of Persia got a constitution only a few months back ! What then do you mean ? You mean this. The word 'constitution' is used in a technical, in a special sense, in political history and political science. What is that sense ? It is this ; constitutional government is that which organises the State machinery, in which there are recognised organs, through which the opinions of the people may apply themselves on the work

of the Government. That is what is understood by constitutional Government. Constitutional governments are governments that allow, by their very constitution, every right to the people to assert their opinions and ideas effectively upon those who govern. That is a constitutional government. And I put it to you, my dear friends, have we any such rights? (cries of No). And if we have not these rights, if we have not the organs by and through which the unanimous opinion of the people of India could apply itself to the work of the Government of India, if we have no such right and no such organ in a State organization, how then can we say that the Government of India is a constitutional government? Take Lord Minto's statement. He distinctly declares that nothing will be done by the Government under pressure of Indian public opinion. Is that the declaration of the constitutional character of the Government of India, I ask? (shame). My friends, understand before you cry 'shame'. And if the Government of India is not a constitutional Government, what becomes of the plea of constitutional agitation? The word, in fact, has been used in a very loose way. The words, 'constitution' and 'constitutional' have been used in a technical sense by lawyers and Indian politicians. They understood by 'constitution' and 'constitutional', simply that which is regulated by law, that which is within the bounds of law. It does not matter who made the law, or who makes them. Constitutional means legal, lawful and absolutely nothing more in India. Constitutional agitation means an agitation which is consistent with the safety of the agitator. Constitutional agitation thus means an agitation that will not conjure up the dreaded Section of 124 A, of the Penal Code. Constitutional agitation means an agitation within the limits of the Penal Code. If that be the meaning of constitutional agitation, the New

Movement has not as yet made any declaration against it. We do not as yet proclaim anything which transgresses the existing laws of the Government of India, and we do not, so far as we see, now believe that it will be necessary for us in the near future to transgress those limits. We respect the laws and we shall respect the laws of the present Government as long as those laws respect the primary rights of citizenship. There are certain rights which Governments do not create, but rights which created Governments themselves. Those are not constitutional rights. They are not created rights. They are natural rights, as my friend in the chair suggests. They are primary rights, rights that inhere to every individual human being, rights the charter of which is received from no man but from Him who stands on High, who endowed every man with his life, with his limbs, who endowed every man with his human instincts, who endowed every man with his intellect and every spiritual and ethical endowment. The charter of these primary rights comes not from any crowned head, but it comes from the King of Kings, from the throne of God himself. And so long as the British Government in India will respect those natural, those primary, those uncreated rights of persons and property of individual Indian citizens, so long we shall respect their laws, and our agitation shall be conducted along such lines. In this sense we may claim to be as constitutional as are those who refuse to accept the constitutional character of our programme and propaganda. This word, 'constitutional' has been used, I repeat, in Indian political literature in a very loose way, to mean not what is always meant in political science and political history, but simply law-abiding, legal, lawful. Now Sir, Lord Minto, before him Mr. Morley, before him Lord Curzon, and before Lord Curzon successive administrators in India,

had worked together to kill the faith that was in this nation, faith in the British people, faith in the British Government, faith in England's altruistic mission in India. This faith had been killed in the course of the last twenty years, and the New Movement has risen up, for it is a new faith out of the ashes of the old faith. In proportion as our faith in the foreign Government has been decaying, in proportion as our dependence on the foreign people and the foreign Government increased and, the realisation of our national destiny grew weaker and weaker, in that proportion things have appeared in Indian politics. On one side there is an overwhelming sense of helplessness. If the Government won't do anything how are we to achieve our end? If the Government will not listen to our prayers, how can we realise what we want to realise ourselves? It is an attitude of despair on one side. The loss of faith in the foreign nation, in the foreign Government and in the foreign people has grown keen, not bitter,—I was going to say keen and bitter—I mean a general sense of despair which leads a lot of people to seek for their own re-generation. 'Since improvement is impossible why follow the chimera? Go and improve yourself. Make your pile and enter into friendly relations with the Government. The people won't be the better or the worse for your association year after year, in the participation of this Government. So, why when all are doomed, should you say, I will not have more than all? I will have As. 15-9 pies and you keep the three pies in the rupee.' That is one attitude that has grown of late in the public life of this country.

There is another attitude, that with the decadence of the faith in the foreign people and in the foreign Government, with the decadence of our faith in the foreign administration

which has come to us. We have learnt to look nearer home. Our eyes have been turned away from the Government House, away from the Houses of Parliament, from Simla and Calcutta and our faces have turned now to the starving, the naked, the patient and long suffering 300 millions of Indian people, and in it we see a new potency, because we view them now with an eye of love which we never had felt before, and in the teeming, toiling, starving and naked populations of India, we find possibilities, potentialities, germs that have given rise to this New Movement. That is the corner-stone of this movement, namely, Faith in the people, Faith in the genius of the nation, Faith in God who has been guiding the genius of this nation through ages by historical evolution, Faith in the eternal destiny of the Indian people. With the decadence of our faith in the foreign Government and in the foreign nation, has grown up this higher, this dearer, this deeper, this more vital and more divine faith in Indian humanity (cheers). And to understand the New Movement properly you must look upon it through the prism of this new faith into the Indian people. To understand this New Movement you must look upon it through the prism of the Indian historic evolution of your race. To understand this New Movement aright, you must look into it through the prism of the highest ideals of your nation, and highest teaching of your scriptures and the highest possibilities of your social, economic, industrial and even your political life. It is not an idle dream. This is the message of Indian history, and this is the highest generalisation, I beg to submit, to a political scientist. Because, after all, what's this Indian problem? Is it a problem of politics? Is it a problem of economics? Is it a problem of administration? I refuse to accept it as such. It is not a political problem, not an economic problem. What is it then? It is a simple, psychological problem.

You do not seem to follow me. How many are the people of this country? Three hundred millions and more. How many are there who govern these people? Less than three lakhs, taking merchants and non-officials together. Now, how can you explain this Government of three-hundred millions of people, not concentrated upon a tiny bit of space like the great island, which is the home of our rulers, but spread over a continent, many times the size of England, the size of Great Britain? You ought to be able to find it for yourself, now, this problem, this strong problem, the government of 300 millions and more of aliens by less than three lakhs of persons over a vast continent. England rules India not by force of arms. It would be an impossibility, utter impossibility. The *Times* might show us his sword. The *Pioneer* might remind us of the tiger claws of the Anglo-Saxon, who, I believe, loses his canine character by association with Bengal climate. They might declare that India shall be governed by the sword and by the sword it will have to be kept It was not won by the sword. British bayonets did not win India. If it was won by the sword, it was the sword of the Indian sepoy that won India for the British nation, and it is not kept by the sword either. How many swords have you got in a district? How many have you got in your Talukas? Have you one single bayonet in a village or can you keep one military man with a bayonet in every village in India. It is utterly impossible. There is no army in all the world possessed by any Power, nay, not even by Germany or Russia, who could place one soldier and for his protection another too, in every village in India (laughter). The sword never won India. When I hear, Sir, ah! England won the Empire of India by the sword, when I am threatened with the sword of the *Times*, I am reminded of the story in the

Upanishads. In the Taitreya Upanishads you know that story that Brahman made the gods conquer the enemies, but the gods forgot all about him. They thought 'it is our glory, it is our conquest.' When the gods were sitting just as they did in the Delhi durbar and Indra was congratulating himself upon the prowess of his thunderbolt by which he had subdued the Asuras and when Agni was also congratulating himself upon his prowess by which he had conquered and Varuna had been doing the same, there appeared a strange figure near the council of the gods. They looked at it but could not recognise it. Who is that unknown figure ? The gods sent Agni, the messenger. 'Go thou and ask who he is.' Agni went and asked, 'Who art thou ?' This strange figure asked Agni, 'Who art thou ?' Agni replied 'I am Agni, I am fire.' 'What canst thou do' asked this strange figure. Agni said, 'I can burn the earth and the heavens.' That strange figure took up a dry piece of grass and held it before Agni, the god of fire, and said, 'Burn thou this.' Agni applied all his force to burn it and failed. Varuna went. He said, 'I can drown everything.' This strange figure said, 'Drown thou this tiny little weed.' Varuna applied all his forces, but the weed could not be drowned. Then Vayu went and said, 'I can blow away everything.' This strange figure said, 'Blow thou this tiny little weed.' But he could not do. They all came and said, 'We do not know who he is.' Then Indra was asked to go. As soon as he went, this strange figure disappeared. In its place appeared the symbol of Divine knowledge and she told Indra that this strange person was He by whose power they had conquered the Asuras, but whom they had forgotten. If, Mr. Chairman, the 300 millions of Indian people could once concentrate, not their strength, but merely their determination and set that determination up in the neighbourhood of the Delhi Durbar, if they ask

who this strange thing is, then they would know that the power that won India was the power of this *yaksha.* The power that governs India is the power of that *yaksha.* In their pride, in their ignorance and in their folly they see not. They are like the scriptural image that has eyes but see not, that has ears but heareth not, that has intelligence, but the intelligence is not applied to the actualities of the situation about them. Who governs India, Sir? It is we who govern India. (How, how?) Go to any district. How many Englishmen are there in a district? Sometimes two, sometimes three, sometimes four, but never more than half-a-dozen. To whose tune do the Magistrates, the Police Superintendents and the Judge play? The Police Superintendent answers to the tune of the Inspector and the Inspector is your man. The Magistrate answers to the tune of the Huzur Sheristadar and the Huzur Sheristadar is your man. It is the Judge who adjudicates. He adjudicates properly more often by the light of the native officials and the native lawyers than by his own imported light. Let me ask, who keeps the peace of the country. It is my Constable, my Chowkidar, my Head Constable and my Sub-Inspector. They are Hindus, Mahomedans or Christians. They are all either brown or black, never white. These sit on the top, receive the fattest pay, but we do the most troublesome, the most arduous, the most difficult, complex and complicated work. The administrative machinery would come to a stand still if we draw ourselves away from it (cries of surely). Then, my dear friends, if it is so, what is the secret of this. Is it hypnotism? Is it magic? Is it incantation? What is it then? (cry of poverty). That is quite a different matter. Now, it is hypnotism. It is Maya, Maya, and Maya, and in the recognition of the magic character of the British power in India lies the strength of the New Movement. What we want is this :—to remove this Maya,

to dispel this illusion, to kill and destroy this hypnotism. We have been hypnotised into the belief that though three hundred millions we might be, yet we are weak. The thing has been dinned into our ears, for how many years you all know. For the last 50 years this thing has been dinned into our ears. For the last one hundred years it has been dinned into our ears that we are weak. They set up one Indian against another, and then call it their conquest. That is how they write our history. They are going to celebrate the festival of Plassey, the festival of Clive, but who fought and conquered, and who was defeated at the battle of Plassey? Mir Jaffir stood away. The treacherous Mir Jaffir stood away. My Mahomedan friends would take note of it, that when the last Mahomedan Nawab was deprived of his Sultanath in Bengal, the only man who fought and tried to die for him was a Hindu gentleman. His Mahomedan General stood aside. Had Mir Jaffir not played the part of a traitor, had Mir Jaffir fought as valiantly and as faithfully as Mohan Lal did, had not that Jagat Sett, that treacherous banker, had not another treacherous member of the Banking aristocracy, had not certain other men, the leaders of the political life of Bengal in those days, conspired in secret against the Nawab, if they had not played themselves into the hands of the tiny little clerk in Fort William, Clive's record of heroism would never have come into existence. This is how the British Empire is being administered by them, but we know it not. The Sheristadar knows not his own power. The Inspector knows not the measure of his own brains. The Deputy Magistrate knows not the important functions that he discharges in the administration of the country. He looks to his pay and looks up to the men who can increase or decrease his pay. He has no time to look into himself, nor about himself, and, therefore, this hypnotism continues. My dear friends, a

moment's cosideration will show that if we are weak to-day this weakness is not real, but illusory. If we are disorganised, this disorganisation is also caused by this hypnotism. If we are disorganised, we must organise ourselves when any vital interest is involved in any matter, and for the safety of that interest, organisation is absolutely necessary. But what vital interest have we in this country outside our personal, private family interest? What interest have we in the Government of this country? You say we cannot govern ourselves because we are divided. You say that we cannot administer our own affairs because there is caste divided from caste, there is religion dividing denominations from denominations. There are the Hindus standing apart from the Mussulmans and the Mussalmans standing apart from the Christians. You say there are so many religions, so many languages, so many castes and so many differences, how will you organise yourselves? Were there not at one time differences of riligion, differences, of classes,conflict of interests, of class against class in England? Were there not provincial differences and jealousies in Germany before the master-hand of Bismarck, helped by the late Emperor William, welded together these heterogenious Germans in one great German nation? Common interests, common life, and the same vital community of interest we have that has made other people forget these differences in the pursuit of that vital thing. Have not we lessons in regard to this in our own past? India knows of only two instances within the memory of history of nation-building. One was in the Punjab, the history of the Sikhs, and the other was in the Deccan, the history of the Maharattas. And what was peculiar in the Punjab? What was peculiar in the Maharashtra? Leave the Punjab alone, because that was the problem that was sought to be worked in a very limited field. Take the history of the Maharattas.

What do you find there ? Sivaji combined not only the Hindus but he combined the Hindus and the Mahomedans both. He united the interests of the two great communities in his own ideal of a Maharashtra. What did Pratap Aditya do in Bengal. You talk of disunion between the English and the Mahomedans. But, at the time of Pratap, the Mahomedan Satrap, Princes in Bengal fought side by side with the Hindus against the common Moghul Emperor, against Munsingh, Akbar's General, when he came to conquer Pratap. There was Isaph, one of the great 12 landlords of Bengal, who were really the ruling chiefs. Isaph joined Pratap and fought with the Moghuls. So, if you can create community of interests, if you can present something that can be regarded by all people as one common ideal, if you can present an ideal that can appeal to every community in India, not to their individuality, not to their peculiar culture and character, but the fulfilment according to his own lines of the highest aspirations that quicken in them, if you can present such an ideal, then all these differences will disappear. We have been told we are disunited and we have believed in it. We have been told that we are weak and we have believed in it. We have been told we are ignorant and we cannot understand politics and we have believed in it, and this belief has been the cause of all our weakness; and it has a hypnotic cause. It is induced by magic, by *Maya* and it is upon a recognition of this *Mayaic* character of the present sovereignty in India that the new movement bases itself, and it proclaims, therefore, that the salvation of India must come first and foremost of all through right knowledge. *Maya* can be dispelled by original knowledge whether it be Vedantic or politic. It is therefore that we proclaim the strength of the people to them. It is, therefore, that we proclaim from the house-tops our ideal It is,

therefore, that we make no secret of our propaganda, because the thing that has to be cleared is this, the sense of helplessness in the people. The thing that has to be fought against is this despair, killing despair in the nation. What you and I want now is the message of strength. What you and I want now is the declaration of some such ideal that will quicken our intellect and culture and our emotions as well, that will take possession of our wills. Such an ideal will lead us to make one united determination to cut asunder this Maya and make us prepare ourselves fo. those sacrifices which this determination will naturally demand in the future. This determination, this sacrifice, this knowledge, this ideal, it is these that would solve the Indian problem, and which the new Movement tries to place before you to-night. But one lecture, though extending over a couple of hours, is not sufficient to explain to you all the aspects, all the principles, much less the great sublime philosophy that stands behind this new movement. It is not a merely political movement, though politics has come to receive, perhaps, the largest amount of its attention just now. This movement is not a mere economic movement, though it is applied to the solution of the great problem of Indian poverty. This movement is essentially a spiritual movement. It has its application in social, in economic, in political life of the sublime theosophy of the Vedanta. It means the desire to carry the message of freedom. It is the supreme message of the Vedanta to carry out that message, to realise that ideal in the social, economic and the political life. What is the message of the Vedanta? The message of the Vedanta is this: that every man has within himself, his own soul, as the very root and realisation of his own being, the spirit of God; and as God is eternally free, self-realised, so is every man eternally free and self-realised. Freedom is man's birth-right. It is his birth-

right in God. It is inherent in the very making of man. Man is made not out of the image, not in the image, but out of the substance of the maker, and as God is eternally free, so are you, prince or peasant, Brahman or Pariah, man or woman, Hindu or Mahomedan, Buddhist or Christian, rich or poor, ignorant or learned, *free and eternal.*

You realise it not, because you are enveloped in ignorance. You realise it not, because freedom has not organised itself as yet in your social life. You realise it not, because this spirit of freedom has not been able to organise itself as yet in your economic life. You realise it not because this freedom, this ideal of freedom has not as yet actualised itself in your political life. They are in the freedom of the free citizen comprising a free state. There and there alone can you recognise, can you actualise, can you objectify, can you bring it before yourself, your own natural freedom. In the citizenship of a free state you regulate yourself, you control yourself, you rule yourself, you restrain yourself; and freedom, my dear friends, is not want of restraint but self-restraint; freedom is not want of regulation but self-regulation, freedom is not want of determination, but self determination and it only consists, as members of a free state, as free citizens of a free state, in the administration of your own affairs, in your submitting yourself to the laws that you helped to make and in submitting yourself to the regulations that you helped to impose upon yourselves and upon the community at large (cheers). That gives the clue to this political life. It is the life of a free citizen in a free state, if you realise the freedom of God which is self-restraint, self-regulation and self-determination for the purpose of self-realisation. (cheers). Therefore, I say this New Movement is not a mere political movement. It

is essentially a spiritual movement. They do not understand its meaning. They cannot understand its strength. They have no faith in this movement unless they recognised as a supremely spiritual movement and because we recognise it so, we believe that the spirit of our race will fulfill and realise itself in and through this movement and shall realise the divinely appointed destiny of our nation. Our faith is first in God, faith in the history in and through which God reveals himself. Our faith is in the history of our own people, and in the genius of our own nation. It is the manifestation within the limits of the spirit of God and God Himself, and because we have this faith, we believe that. We are disorganised to-day, but we shall become organised to-morrow. We are weak to-day but we can become strong in our own native strength to-morrow. We believe we are incapable of self-sacrificing to-day but we shall attain the strength for making the self-sacrifice to-morrow, and by this means, by determination, by self-sacrifice and by combination we shall be able sooner or later to realise the end that this New Movement has set up, namely that of *Swaraj*. (continued cheers and cries of *Bande Mataram*).

The Gospel of Swaraj

(THE SECOND LECTURE.)

[Mr. Pal, who was received with enthusiastic cheering, addressed the meeting for two hours as follows :]

Mr. Chairman, friends and fellow-countrymen, the word Swaraj, on which I have been asked to speak to you to night, is a new word in the literature of modern Indian politics. This word was given to us during the last session of the Indian National Congress by its honoured President, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroj (shouts of Vande Mataram). Mr. Dadabhai standing on the platform of the Indian National Congress as the representative, the accredited,—I was almost going to say, the elected,—representative of all India declared that *Swaraj*, i. e., self-government, was the goal of his people. This declaration is peculiarly significant. If Mr. Dadabhai stopped after saying 'self-government was our goal,' it would have meant nothing or anything. Self-government is an old word in Indian politics, and it had been applied by different persons, officials and non-officials, in quite a number of ways; but Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji did not stop by merely declaring that our ideal was self-government. His definition was extremely significant. It was significant because of certain things that had happened a few months before the meeting of the Congress. This definition that Mr. Dadhabai gave of self Government was also significant in view of an earlier definition of his own. The definition that he had given to self-Government, the declaration of the ideal of the National Congress, that he had made on the eve of the session of the Congress in Madras in 1903, addressing the Congressmen in this country in a series of letters from different Congress leaders in England—all these were published

in the pages of the *Hindustan Review*, Allahabad—was that the ideal of the Congress was self-government under British paramountcy.

SELF-GOVERNMENT UNDER BRITISH PARAMOUNTCY.

This ideal was not very clearly understood by some of us. We did not exactly understand what the character of this self-government would be, what would be its limits and what would be the conditions that British paramountcy would impose upon our self-government. These are questions that arise in our minds when we read this declaration from the oldest leader of Indian political life. (Hear, hear). Would our self-government mean what it means in other self-governing countries? Would it mean the right of self-taxation? Would it mean the right of self-legislation? Would it mean the right of the people of India to grant admission or to refuse it to whomsoever they like, seeking entrance into their territories from outside? Would it mean, this self-government under British paramountcy, these and other essential rights and privileges of other self-governing communities? If it meant all this, where would the paramountcy come in? (Laughter.) The paramountcy might come in the matter of our foreign relations; but foreign relations can only be controlled by the help of a national army. The ultimate argument in diplomacy among the nations of the world is not an argument of reason, but an argument of force, not applied, but possible of being applied at any moment when the constitution might demand it and when diplomacy might fail. Without a background of military power, foreign relations have never been known to be controlled any where, in barbarity or civilization (Hear, hear). England, therefore, if she controlled our foreign relations, would naturally and very reasonably also demand

the control of our army and if she had to control our army she would be forced by the necessity of the duty that the controlling of the army would impose upon her, to demand the control of the purse of the nation. And if this is so, where would the right of self-taxation and the right of self-administration go? It would be, I dare say, an exceedingly convenient thing for us if England would mind guarding our frontiers, at her own expense (Hear, hear and cheers) with her own people and allowed us the supreme and precious privilege of taxing ourselves, governing ourselves and doing everything that a self-governing people does. It would be very comfortable for us, but it would be exceedingly uncomfortable for England (cheers) and England would not undertake this great and glorious duty unless we agree to pay her for it. But you might say—why England does it in regard to the Colonies, she does it in regard to Australia, she does it in regard to Canada. Why should she not do it in regard to India? The one answear to it is this. England is white. Australia is white. Canada is white (laughter). We are black and brown (laughter and cheers,) That is one answer. England would do a great deal for a white people, even for the Boers who had put her to such endless troubles seven years back. But she would not do it for a non-white people. Professor Bryce, I think, it would be admitted, knows something of the mind of his own people. It will be admitted, there are few men in English public life who have had larger experience of modern politics in England and even in Greater Britain than the distinguished author of the Holy Roman Empire and the American Common Wealth. Therefore, his authority must be respected in this matter. And what did he say just about 3 or 4 years back? At an address delivered in the Sheldonian Theatre in Oxford, Professor Bryce said: " The colour sense of the Anglo-Saxon is

one of his strongest senses. The Asiatics may overcome their sense of colour, but the European cannot, and least of all, can it be expected of the Anglo-Saxon European." Again, the relation between England and her Colonies can never possibly be the relation between India and England. England sends out her surplus population to the Colonies and the Colonies receive with open arms the immigrants from the mother country, because they help the Colonies to develop their own resources. They help the Colonies to exterminate the native race. They help the Colonies to strengthen the white power in distant parts of the globe. Therefore England is interested in the upkeep of the Colonies. Can you expect that the same thing would happen with regard to India? Can you expect on your own side, to receive the surplus population of the British Isles into your midst? (no, no) But the Colonies recieve them. You would not, but you receive them now, because you cannot help it (yes, exactly so), and therefore the moment you have *Swaraj*, the moment you have self-government, the moment you have the right to exclude whomsoever you like from getting inside your territories,—that moment you will pass a law, as Australia has done, against all undesirable aliens and Australia has passed this law against even the residents, the inhabitants, the subjects of the British Empire. You and I, unless we know to read and write at least one European language, cannot go into Australia. It is not in human nature that when you and I have the same right as the Australians have to granting admission to, or refusing this admission to any foreigner, we shall not exercise this right for excluding undesirable aliens. England cannot expect the same help from India as she can naturally expect from Australia, from

Canada, and from the other Colonies. India cannot expect the same accession to its national life and strength by the influx of white emigration as the Australians and Canadians expect it. Therefore what England is doing in regard to Australia or Canada, undertaking the expenses for the protection of her Colonies, she will not do, she will not undertake in regard to a self governing India.

THE DECLARATION.

Therefore, it seems to me, Sir, that this ideal of self-government under British paramountcy is an impossible ideal. It might be a theoretically perfect ideal (laughter), making for the universal brotherhood of man but the millennium has not yet arrived, and it is not in any case a practically attainable ideal—that is, the ideal of self-government, under British paramountcy; for either British paramountcy would mean nothing or self-government would mean nothing. We do not understand this ideal of self-government under British paramountcy; we do not make any secret of our opinions and estimates regarding it, and a few months before the Session of the last Congress, some of us were driven by the kindness—I will call it—of the newspaper *India* and its partiality for the Liberal administration in England,—we were driven by certain remarks that were made in regard to Mr. Morely's last budget speech by the newspaper *India*—to make a very simple declaration. That declaration was this. It was made first through the columns of the 'notorious' newspaper called *Bande Mataram*:—

" The time has come when in the interest of truth and the civic advancement and the freedom of the people, our British friends should be distinctly told that while we are thankful to them for all the kind things they have said all

these years for us and the ready sacrifice they have made to make our lot easy and their yoke light, we cannot any longer suffer to be guided by them in our attempts for political progress and emancipation. Their weapon is not ours; they desire to make the Government in India popular. They desire to make the Government in India popular without ceasing in any sense to be essentially British. We desire to make it autonomous, absolutely free of the British Parliament." (Loud cheers and shouts of *Vande Matharam*).

This declaration, a very natural thing even in a subject people—an honest expression of the common human instincts of freedom—this took our Anglo-Indian friends by surprise. They never thought that such a thing might be said or could possibly be said by any Indian journalist. They held up their hands in *harry-carry* and thought that we were going very close to the deluge. The *Englishman* in Calcutta ran into hysterics (cries of shame), the *Pioneer* did the same and threatened us with a series of evil consequences. The *Times of India* did the same. The London *Times* also quoted the paragraph in full, and for a number of days it tried to prove that this was the declaration of a small band of irresponsible persons, who deserved to be put down. That was what the *Times* practically said and the *Times of India* coaxed, begged, beseeched the moderate politicians,—the model moderates—to make a declaration from the Congress that whatever else might happen, the Congress does not subscribe and will never subscribe till the end of the world, to such a declaration as this'. The *Times of India* and even the London *Times* did something more. They held out temptations to the Moderate leaders in the matter. They said: "If only you expel the extremist, and make an open declaration of policy from the

Congress platfrom that you desire the perpetuation of the British overlordship, then your cause will be strengthened. The Muhammadans who are holding aloof will join it at once and there is a very strong and sensible body of non-official Anglo Indian opinion which would also throw in its strength with you and join the National Congress and by this means the Congress would be a power in the land and the Government would be bound to treat with respect and consideration the representations of such a body". The *Times of India* asked Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in a sudden outburst of love for the old man whom it had abused outright and the London *Times* also said that whatever Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's views on economics might be, he was at heart a loyal man and would of course make some declaration that would put an end to all this nonsense. And the declaration than Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji actually made became extremely significant on account of this little previous history. The *Times of India* wanted Mr. Dadabhai, the London *Times* wanted the National Congress to declare it officially and openly, that they would not go in for autonomous India, that their ideal was self-government under British paramountcy.

This had been declared to be the ideal of the Congress, as I said, by Mr. Dadabhai some years back. Mr. Dadhabhai, however, standing on the platform of the Congress last year refused to report the old declaration (hear, hear). He refused to condemn this new ideal. On the contrary, he declared an ideal which practically accepted the declaration of policy made by that notorious paper *Bande Matharam*. What did Mr. Naoroji say ? He said self-government is our ideal. What kind of self-government ? " Self-Government as in the United Kingdom or in the Colonies ". That is *Swaraj*

These are the words so far as I remember of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. "Self-Government as in the United Kingdom," what does it mean but the right of self taxation? What does it mean but the right of self Legislation? What does it mean but the right of self administration and what does it mean but the supreme control of the nation over its political affairs, home affairs and foreign affairs, civil affairs and military affairs. That is what is meant by self-Government as in the United Kingdom. Mr. Naoroji added also, self-Government as in the United Kingdom or the Colonies. It means that in the opinion of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the self-government that obtains in the Colonies is essentially and practically the same as that which obtains in the United Kingdom, because the Colonies also have the right of self-taxation, have the right of self-legislation, have the right of self-administration, and if the mother country controls the political relations and the foreign relations of the Colonies, it is simply owing to the fact that the mother country undertakes to pay for this control in Military expenditure and when once Great Britain wanted a contribution immediately after the close of the Boer war from Australia towards the expenses of the squadrons of the British fleet stationed on the Pacific, Australia point blank refused to pay even a farthing towards those expenses and therefore practically speaking self-government in the Colonies is the same as self-government in the United Kingdom. I would draw your attention to the construction of the sentence in which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji made this declaration. Dadabhai did not say that the ideal was Colonial self-government. He said our ideal was self-government as in the Colonies, and I think, Sir, as a lawyer, you will understand there is a difference between 'Colonial self-government' and 'self-government as in the Colonies' (cheers and laughter). Colonial self-government means the perpetuation of the rela-

tion of the existing British Colonies with the mother country; self-government as in the Colonies means self-government similar to that obtaining in the Colonies, not identical with it. Colonial Self-government would declare identity of our ideal with the kind of self-government obtaining in the colonies. Self-government as in the Colonies does not declare that identity. It simply points as a sample and when you copy a pattern, you necessarily copy it with more or less certain slight differences, differences due to personal equation and here the differences would be due to national equation. This declaration then from Dadabhai Naoroji is a significant declaration. This is really the same ideal that had been proclaimed by us. This declaration meant an open repudiation by Dadabhai Naoroji of the claims that had been put forward by the *Times of India* and the London *Times*. And, gentlemen, Dadabhai Naoroji made this declaration first of all in his presidential address; but towards the close of the session, in his closing speech he emphasised this declaration still further. He declared that as the result of the labours of the last 50 years, this generation had been able to discover this great national ideal of *Swaraj*. He said: "The generation that is passing away gives you, young men, this ideal. It devolves on you to work it out in practice." These are the last words of Dadabhai Naoroji, uttered from the chair of the Indian National Congress last December and they are significant words. After the declaration of Dadabhai Naoroji it is no longer possible, Sir, for Moderates or Extremists to say that they are not Swarajists. They are compelled now to accept with good grace or with bad grace, but they are compelled to accept—this ideal as the national ideal.

Mr Gokhale's ideal and the Extremist ideal.

Mr. Gokhale went to Allahabad in February and he pro-

claimed the same ideal at Allahabad. He said that he would not put any limitation, any limits to the aspirations of his countrymen. He said that he wanted his people to live in their country as other peoples live in their own countries. And by other peoples he necessarily meant not the Hottentot, not the Zulu, not the Fiji Islander, but he meant the free peoples of the world. And he said that he wanted his own people in India believe just as the other peoples of the world, lived in their own countries. That was a paraphrase of the ideal of *Swaraj.* Mr. Gokhale with the emphasis on the ethical side of every question that is so predominant both in his life and conversation, declared further that he wanted that his people should attain the highest that is in them in their intellectual, in their industrial, in their moral, and in their spiritual life. What does it mean, Sir, unless it means a declaration of the ideal of *Swaraj.* He did not use the world *Swaraj*, it is true; but we ought not to forget that he is a member really of the Government of India, because, according to the constitution of that Government, every member of the Legislative Council is really a member of the Government of India as every member of Parliament constitutes a part of the Government of England. So every member of the Legislative Council forms a part of the organic element in the constitution of the Government of India. But Mr. Gokhale said it was a theoretically perfect ideal; but not practically attainable. I don't understand an ideal that is theoretically perfect but which is absolutely unattainable practically. That which is not practically attainable, is not an ideal I beg to submit; it is fancy, it is a figment of the imagination. It is a dream. It is poetry. It is a fairy abstraction; but it is not an ideal. Modern thought does not recognise abstractions. The ideal is organically related to the real, the ideal is implied in the real, the ideal is involved in the real and

the ideal is based on actualities of the real. It is not something that comes from the outside. Where do you find the ideal of the rose. Is it in the lotus? No. It is in the rose, the tiny little rose itself suggests the ideal of a full blown rose and it is in the rose, in the reality of the rose, that you find the ideal of the rose suggested but never exhausted by it; so the ideal of humanity you find in man or woman or the general human race and not any where else. It is in the realities of our human life and activities that we find the suggestion of the ideal of the human race; the ideal of humanity. So, that which is not practically attainable is not an ideal, it is a fancy, it is a poesy. It is a dream, it is a fanciful abstraction and our ideal of *Swaraj* would not be an ideal if it were not practically attainable. Mr. Gokhale says that this ideal of *Swaraj* is not practically attainable. Why? because the English people will not understand it. They understand self-government within the Empire but they do not understand and will not understand, and will fight shy of his outlandish ideal of *Swaraj*. But, I ask you gentlemen, to consider for one moment if self-government within the Empire is a really practically attainable ideal, what guarantee have we that the British people, those responsible British statesmen, would be willing to grant us even this practically attainable privilege of self-government within the Empire? What did Mr. Morley, Honest John, say last autumn in the course of his budget speech? I referred to it last night. I will refer to it once more to night. 'As long as my imagination reaches, so long', Mr. Morley said, 'the Government of India must continue to be a personal and absolute Government.' What is a personal Government, Sir? What are the characteristics of absolute government? Is self-government consistent with the ideal of personal government, unless you refer to the self-government of the person who

governs and not of those who are governed. Is self-government consistent with absolute government? Has Russia self-government? Why not, because the Czar is an absolute monarch there. Has Afghanistan self-Government? Why not?, because Habibulla is an absolute monarch in Afghan territory. Has Persia self-government? Only very recently and if she had not, it was because the rule that obtained in Persia was a personal and absolute rule. Personal and absolute Government is dramatically opposed to self-government in any real shape or form and therefore how are we to know in the face of this open,this deliberate declaration,by the most distinguished, the most broad-minded, the most sympathetic, the most philosophical and the most literary of the English liberal statesmen? How are we to understand in the face of his broad open declaration, by a man like Mr. John Morley, the right-hand man of the late Mr. Gladstone? How are we to understand in the face of such a declaration that they would listen to our demands of self-government if only we shall keep it within the Empire more considerately and kindly than they are likely to listen to our demand for absolute autonomy or *Swaraj*.

PRACTICALLY ATTAINABLE IDEALS.

Then again, Sir, is really self-Government within the Empire a practicable ideal. What would it mean? It would mean—I have to repeat once more what I said just now either no real self-Government for us or no real overlordship for England. Would we be satisfied with a shadow of self-Government? If not, would England be satisfied with the shadow of overlordship? In either case England would not be satisfied with a shadowy overlordship. We refuse to be satisfied with a shadowy self-government. (Hear, hear and cheers.) And therefore no compromise is possible under such conditions

between self-government in India and the overlordship of England. The fact of the matter is this; England will not think of granting us any measure of real self-government until she is compelled to do so. (Hear hear.) And when the compulsion becomes irresistible, when the pressure of Indian public opinion becomes absolutely irresistible and the alternative before England is either to give us substantial self-government or lead to the severance of India's connection with England, (hear, hear.) when that alternative presents itself before English statesmen, it is then only that they will begin to consider any demands that you and I may make for a substantial measure of self-government in India; and if self-government is conceded to us, what would be England's position not only in India but in the British Empire itself. Self-government means right of self-taxation, it means right of financial control, it means the right of the people to impose protective and prohibitive tariff on foreign imports. The moment we have the right of self-taxation, what shall we do? We shall not try to be engaged in this uphill work of Industrial boycott. But we shall do what every nation or almost every nation did, why, every nation has done. Under the circumstances in which we live now we shall impose a heavy prohibitive protective tariff upon every inch of textile fabric from Manchester. We shall impose a protective, prohibitive tariff upon every blade of knife that comes from Leeds. We shall refuse to grant admittance to a British soul into our territory. We shall make it impossible for Mauritius as well as for Australia and Belgium and France to carry our sugar industries by carrying cheap beet-root sugar from their territories here. And then England's trade with India would be a thing of the past (Laughter). That is what we would do. Would England consent to it? This grand ideal of an Indian Parliament or an

Indian Legislative assembly imposing a prohibitive tariff on Manchester, Sheffield, Leeds and other foreign British imports. It is more thinkable. Does it appeal better to the self-interest of Englishmen than *Swaraj* ? then what else. We would refuse admittance to Englishmen within these territories. They would not be permitted to develop the natural resources of our country and convert us into a race of coolies. They would not be permitted to set up the Agricultural Institute at Pusa in Berar with a view to the exploitation of agricultural resources of that rich province. We would not allow British capital to be engaged in the development of Indian resources as British capital is now engaged, we would not grant any right to British capitalist to dig up the mineral wealth of the land and carry it to their own isle. We would refuse to do all these things. We shall want foreign capital. We must want foreign capital for the development of our own resources. But we shall apply for foreign loan in the open market of the whole world guaranteeing the credit of the Indian Government, the Indian Nation, for the repayment of the loan just as America had done and is doing, just as Russia is doing now, just as Japan has been doing of late ; and England's commerical interest in India will not be farthered in the way these are being furthered now under the conditions of popular self-Government in this country, though it might be within the empire? But what would it mean if within the empire ? It would mean that England would have to enter into some arrangement with us for some preferential tariff. England would have to come to our markets on the conditions that we would impose on her for the purpose, and if she wanted to have an open door, an honest Swadeshism in India, we would also, perhaps not immediately, but after a while, when we have developed our resources a little and organised an industrial life, we would want open door not only to England but

to every part of the British Empire. And do you know there is a British Empire growing in secret and silence on the African continent as a possible set off against the Indian Empire and we would almost occupy to the practical exclusion of England over the markets in the future African British Empire as England occupied every market in India to-day. And do you think it is possible for a small country like England with a handful of population although she might be enormously wealthy to compete on fair and equitable terms with a mighty continent like India, with an immense natural resources, with her teeming populations, with her labouring millions, the soberest and the most abstemious labouring population known to any other part of the world. If we have really self-Government within the Empire, if we have the rights of freedom of the Empire as Australia has, as Canada has, as England has herself to-day, if we, the 300 millions of people, have that freedom of the Empire, the Empire would cease to be the British. It would be the Indian Empire and the alliance between England and India would be absolutely an unequal alliance. It would be, as I have said elsewhere like tying a big brass vessel with a small earthen pot and throwing it at the breakers there. That would be if we had really self-government within the Empire That would exactly be the relation as co-partners in a co-British or the anti-British Empire of the future, and if the day comes when England will be reduced absolutely to the alternative of having us as an absolutely independent people or a co-partner with her in the Empire, she would prefer to have us like the Japanese an ally and no longer a co-partner, because we are bound to be the predominant partner in this imperial firm. Therefore, no sane Englishman, politician or publicist, can ever contemplate seriously the possibility of a self-governing India like the self-governing Colonies forming a vital and organic

part of the British Empire. It is, therefore, that Mr. Morley says that so long as India remains under the control of Great Britain, the Government of India must continue to be a personal and absolute Goverment. It is for this reason that Lord Minto says that it would be a dangerous and mischievous thing for the Indian Government to be allowed to be controlled by public opinion in India. It is, therefore, that Lord Curzon said that as long as the Government in India continue to be British, the direction of the affairs of this Government, the direction and the control of its policy must entirely rest with the British and not with the Indian people. Therefore it seems to me that this ideal, the practically attainable ideal of self-Government within the Empire, when we analyse it with care, when we study it in the light of common human psychology, when we study it in the light of our past experience of racial characteristics of the British people, when we study in the light of past British history in India and in other parts of the world, when we study and analyse this ideal of self-Government within the Empire, we find that it is a far more impracticable thing to attain even our ideal of Swaraj.

Our difficulties and deficiences.

Now, Sir, when we talk of this ideal of Swadeshi we are told of our difficulties and deficiencies. We are reminded of our want of muscle. Mr. Gokhale reminded us of it at Allahabad or Lucknow. Our want of muscle, the lack of the spirit of self-sacrifice in the country, our want of union, the Hindus being at war with the Mahomedans, and all these things are conjured up before the mind's vision with a view to scare us away from this glorious ideal of swaraj, and gentlemen, the attainment of this swaraj was no child's play. It will not be done by mere

public meetings and enthusiastic demonstrations. I recognise, Sir, as fully and as clearly and as strongly as anybody else in this country the enormous difficulties that stand in our way. It would be the height of folly on the part of any man who really desires to realise the ideal of *swaraj* to underestimate the difficulties that stand in our way. It would be also an act of suicide to over-estimate them. Let us take a proper measure of these difficulties and recognising these difficulties the question is, "Will the continuance of our present policy, the moderate policy of association with, and opposition to, the Government, will this policy, this policy of trying to appease the authorities with a view to secure small mercies, will this policy of moderate Indian politics help to remove these difficulties or will they help to increase and strengthen them." This is the question I put before you. You talk of the Hindu-Mahomedan difficulty. This difficulty was not in existence 30 or 40 years ago. This difficulty was unknown 50 years back, even during the turbulent times of the Sepoy Mutiny. How then these difficulties and by whom have they been created? It is not possible to answer this question, because no man knows the secret of the political movements in any part of the world. So we do not know under whose inspiration and moved by what impulse the Mahomedans have fallen away in some parts of India from the Hindus, or why the Hindus have not been able to bring the Mahomedans to their own ranks. But this much I will say that this conflict between the Hindus and the Mahomedans is not industrial conflict. Our interests are identical. There is nothing in the agricutural life of the country which creates any conflict at the present time between the Mahomedan agricuturist and the Hindu agriculturist. There is absolutely no conflict between these two great communities in the trade-life of the land. The Mahomedan shopkeeper peacefully does his business side by side

with the Hindu shokeepers, and there is absolutely no conflict in trade matters between Mahomedan traders as a class and the Hindu traders as a class. There might be conflicts, rivalries between individual shop-keepers. Such rivalries exist between one Hindu shopkeeper and another Hindu shopkeeper. Such rivalries exist in some bazars of Hindus and Mahomedans. It is not in the commerical life or in the agricultural life that there is any conflict of interest. In the industrial life there is no conflict of interest. Our trade is more in the hands of the Mahomedans than even in the hands of the Hindus, where then is the conflict of interest. The conflict of interest is in the Government service, and in those honorary offices like membership of the Legislative Councils and Municipal and District Boards (cries of Bycott. That is no doubt a good suggestion, we shall come to that later on.) It is here in the competition for Government appointments, it is here in the rivalry in Municipal and District Boards or Legislative Council Membership, it is here that the interests of the two seem just now to stand in opposition to one another, and this opposition is due entirely to the fact that these offices are in the gift of the foreign administration. The English ruler throws out a bone in the form of a Sub-Registrarship between the Hindus and the Mahomedans and two fight for that bone. He throws out a High Court Judgeship and the Mahomedan Barrister and the Hindu Pleader fight for that bone in the High Court. He throws out a few bones of Legislative Council Membership and the Hindus and the Mahomedans try to fight over this. It is just in those matters that are in the keeping of the foreign bureaucracy, it is in regard to these matters and these matters alone that this new conflict has been created between the Hindus and the Mahomedans in this country. And is it likely, my dear sirs, I want to know, that a continuance of the responsible authority

in the politics in this country of this alien bureaucracy that will make for the amalgamation of the Hindu and Mahomedan interests. I answer no. It is the system of the administration they have introduced that is responsible for this conflict and the effect cannot be removed as long as the cause exists. Therefore, it is impossible to hope for a solution of the Hindu-Mahomedan problem under existing conditions and even self-Government within the Empire will not solve it. You talk of the development of muscle. You talk of the physical powers of the people. We are emasculated. We have been awfully degenerated in our physique. Partly our poverty is responsible for it and partly the restrictive regulations of the Government in certain matters are also responsible for it. We are not permitted to form a Volunteer corps of our own. The Madrasis acquired half of India for the British at one time, but the Madrasi is not now admitted as he used to be into the British army. As I was passing through the Northern Circars I happened to see in the way half a dozen men of the Reddiar caste. Finer specimens of physical humanity I had never seen in all my travels over three continents, and I wanted to take photograph of these men and write underneath this photograph—who sayest, mother, thou art without prowess or strength. These Reddiars might make the finest army in any part of the world, but they are not allowed to enter the British army in India. Why? The answer comes neither from the Government nor is it possible for our moderate friends to render a satisfactory answer. can muscle be developed without a national militia? Can muscle and muscular power be developed when a whole nation is disarmed by the outrageous Arms Act. Impossible. When we are deprived of the right of defending our own country by our own muscle, muscular development is a dream that can never be realised until the Government removed the restrictions

of the Arms Act. They are making the administration of that Act more and more stringent in every part of India. This Arms Act we owe to the administration of Lord Lytton. During the electioneering campaign that followed the dissolution of the Beaconsfield Cabinet in 1881 Mr. Gladstone attacked most strongly the Vernacular Press Act, the Arms Act and the Cabul war during the administration of Lord Lytton in India. When Mr. Gladstone got into power he sent out his chosen man Lord Ripon to this country to undo the evil that had been done by the Beaconsfield-Lytton administration. Lord Ripon came and went away but the Arms Act remained and it remains even to-day. Lord Ripon did something. He repealed the Vernacular Press Act; why? Because it was necessary in the interests of the Government to repeal that pernicious Act for this reason. If we stop our newspapers to-day, if we stop our public meetings to-day, the Government, the foreign bureaucracy who know not the mind of the people and have no means of knowing their mind would run mad in twenty-four hours, under the weight of anxiety. They also admitted that the Vernacular Press Act was like sitting on the safety valve. It lets out the gas which if accumulated might lead to the outburst of the boiler; and in whose interest I say has the safety valve to be kept open? Not in the interest of the valve itself, but in the interest of the machinery which is saved by its being kept open. Who is injured? Grief and harm comes to him, in the matter of this safety valve, to the man who sits on it, and who was sitting upon it? The Government of India, through this Vernacular Press Act, therefore, in the interests of their own safety and salvation had to leave the safety valve and come out and sit elsewhere. That was how the Act came to be repealed, but the Arms Act was not a dangerous thing to the Government. It worked harm to the people, but it made the

administration of the country easy and safe. Therefore, the Arms Act could not be repealed. That is the character, Sir, of the British policy, liberal or conservative. I do not blame that policy. As I said last night, the British are a human people and the instinct of self-preservation is as strong in individuals as it is in nations, as it is also in organisations, whether social or political and the instinct of self-preservation in the Government of India compelled them to repeal the Vernacular Press Act, and the same instinct led them to coutinue the Arms Act and it leads them still now to continue it and increase its stringency. Therefore development of muscle or whatever else you may say is impossible as long as this Act is not repealed, and they will not repeal this Act simply because you and I want it. No nation, Sir, no Government has ever been known as yet to commit harri-karri in the interests of political emancipation of its subjects. The Government of the Czar, has not committed suicide simply to emancipate the Russian people and the Foreign Government in India will not attempt by anything that we may say or do to commit suicide in our interest. That is a thing which you and I will have to bear in mind. Bearing this in mind we can dismiss without further consideration this plea of want of muscle as a plea for the continuance of the present order of things. From whatever point of view you look upon it, it is impossible not only to attain but even to advance towards your goal as long as the present order has not changed. Mr. Gokhale talked of intellectual advancement. Is intellectual advancement really possible in India under present conditions. Don't you recognise what a large share every State has in the development of the intellectual life of its subject population. And is the Government of India run along such lines as are likely to develop the intellect of the nation. Colonel Du. Pre, a member of the Government of India Survey staff, in his

evidence before the Public Service Commission made a significant declaration. He said "I never allow my native assistants to do any scientific work. I never allow them to touch the theodolite. I never allow them to do any real scientific work, because if we allow them to do it there will be no justification for our drawing the higher pay that we do now. This was what Colonel Du Pre said, and you will find it in the records of the evidence before the Public Service Commission. Does it not indicate the general Policy of British Government in regard to the intellectual life of your people? How can it be otherwise, sir? We are so related to one another, the people of India and the foreign nation that rules them now, that our economic loss is their economic gain. Our economic gain is their economic loss. Every inch of textile fabric that is turned out by our hand-looms means the exclusion of a corresponding inch of Manchester manufactured article from the Indian market. Every expansion of the industries of India means a corresponding contraction of the trade of England with this country. Every ounce of sugar that we grow and that we consume in India means an ounce less of imported sugar in our market. Every blade of knife that is turned by our blacksmith means the loss of the value of one blade of knife to Sheffield and Leeds. Now, it stands almost as an open thing. Our economic interests are in perpetual conflict under existing conditions with the economic interest of the British nation and the British Government, and our loss economically is England's gain. Our gain economically is England's loss. Similarly in regard to our intellectual life. You will remember, some of you at any rate, the important declaration made by Lord Curzon when he went out to England in the interregnum between one Viceroyalty and another. He made an important speech then in the Guildhall, London,

and in that speech he put forward the claims of the Indian Government upon the attention of the British people, and what did he say then. He said that the Government of India offered the best training ground for the intellect of England and the character of England. If it is so, it means so much loss of opportunity for the intellectual advancement and development of manly character to us, people of the country. Every high office that is in the keeping of an Englishman means not merely so much pay and pension, so much money, it means something far more valuable than pay or pension. It means so much intellectual or moral asset credited to England, and so much intellectual and moral loss credited to the people of India. Responsiblity and opportunity are the two schools for the development of human mind and human character. So far as the Government of India is concerned, both these schools are crammed almost in every form by the foreigner, and we are excluded from these schools; and it means intellectual and moral loss. It means intellectual and moral gain to England. Our intellectual loss is England's intellectual gain. Our moral loss is England's moral gain. Our moral gain is England's moral loss. Our intellectual gain is England's intellectual loss. They are as clear as daylight and when you consider this perpetual conflict of interest, economic, intellectual and moral between one nation and another, how can you expect that the nation which holds supreme authority over you now will, however good and generous, commit economic suicide, intellectual harri-karri and moral self-immolation with a view to advance your economic life, with a view to help the development of your intellectual life, or with a view to advance your spiritual and moral culture. No, Sir, Mr. Gokhale talks of his ambition to see the manhood of the nation fully developed. I say

under existing relations between this foreign bureaucracy and the people of this country, it is impossible for the manhood of India to reach this natural perfection. It is absolutely impossible; and therefore, this ideal of self-government within the Empire, this policy of association with, and opposition to, the Government, this policy of helping to smooth down the rough places of the adminstration will not do. They talk of British liberalism. They talk of a liberal policy and liberal sympathies. I say, Sir, our people had a clearer insight into the history of liberal politics. Before the Act of 1832 what was Liberal politics in England. After the Act of 1832 until very recently, what was the character of liberal policy, the policy of the Manchester School of British liberalism, the policy of Bright and Cobden? What was the liberal policy 50 years ago in England? It was the policy of *laissez faire*, a policy of not allowing Government to do anything more than giving peace and protection to the people. There are certain primary rights inherent in every subject, under every Government. So there are certain primary responsibilities that rest with every Government, whether that Government be despotic or constitutional. And those responsibilities are the responsibilities of giving protection to the person and property of the subject population, and the policy of *Laissez faire* demands that the activities of the State shall be confined to this limit and limit alone, namely, that the state shall do nothing more than simply give protection to the person and property of the people, and leave the people to work out their own emancipation, their own progress, to work out their own problems, industrial, educational and political, themselves. That was the policy of British liberalism, and why that is the natural policy, because I say that is the natural policy under the conditions that exist in England in those days.

What were those conditions? The main condition was the conflict between the prerogative of the Crown and the privileges of the people. The Crown wanted to appropriate to itself as much of the rights of Government as it could appropriate, and those who wanted to expand the rights of the people had necessarily to fight the authority of the Crown, and the authority of the Crown they knew would be so strengthened by the beneficient activities of the Crown among the people. If before 1832 there was free reduction in England, what would have been the condition of popular freedom in England? The Government in its own interest would educate people in loyalty and not in a democratic spirit. If 20 years back there was a talk of old age pension in England, it would have been fought outright by every Liberal Statesman in the country, simply because old age pension would incerease and strengthen the hold of the Government upon the people, and the objective of Liberalism in those days was not to strengthen the hold of the people on the Government but to weaken that hold; and, therefore, the activities of the Government had to be restricted. Therefore, their ideal was not to make for good Government. Their ideal was not to make Government good but to confine the activities of the Government to the narrowest possible limits, and in view of this conflict of interests between the Government and the people in India our policy ought to be the policy, the old Liberal policy of *laissez faire*, restrict Government to their own primary responsibilities. Let the Government take care of the person and property of the people. Let them do nothing more, and let everything else be done by the people by their own exertions independently of the Government, because every beneficent work that a despotic Government does, increases the hold of that despotism upon the affections and the allegiance, if not

upon the affections and the allegiance, upon the acquiescence of the people. In that lies the strength of Governments and if a despotic Government has had its peculiar acquiescence of the general population of the country, Liberalism, freedom and progressive politics is impossible of attainment in that country (Hear, Hear.). Therefore our policy is a policy of *laissez faire* and by insisting upon this policy by restricting the Government to its narrowest possible limits to the discharge of those duties which it is bound to discharge, because it imposes taxes on us, by restricting the activities of the Government to the primary functions of granting protection to the people of this country, we hope some day to develop the spirit of self-sacrifice, the spirit of self-reliance, the spirit of self-determination in the people, and by this means we hope some day to attain the ideal of *Swaraj*.

With a few remarks from the chair, the gathering dispersed.

Swaraj : Its Ways and Means.

(THIRD LECTURE.)

Mr. Chairman and friends, Before I take up the thread of my last evening's address, I desire with your premission, Sir, to say one word in regard to a statement, I was going to say an accusation, that has been made against me by my old friend the *Hindu.*

It has been said, that in interpreting Lord Minto's latest pronouncement and placing it on a level with the pronouncement of Lord Curzon, I have not been accurate, I have put an inaccurate and misleading interpretation upon His Excellency's words. I am a little careful about these charges, I am used to recognise, and I have been trained from my youth onward to respect differences of opinion, but I may claim it, I think, Sir, that even our rankest enemies, I mean of the Anglo-Indian Press, have not as yet found it easy to bring any charge of this kind against me. Whatever else I may be, I have never tried to do except the fullest justice to my political opponents. Therefore, I am compelled to take notice of this charge brought against me by a very friendly critic who says thus :—

" We must take exception, however, to a statement made by Mr. Pal with reference to His Excellency Lord Minto, which we think is an inaccourate, misleading statement which ought not, in our opinion, to be left uncorrected." Then the writer quotes my words. What Lord Curzon said has been repeated by Lord Minto only two months back in his Budget Speech. What does Lord Minto say ? He says that it is abolutely necessary that whatever reforms are introduced by the Government of

India they must be initiated by that Government itself, and it would be a mischievous thing for the British Government in India if the idea got abroad that the Government of India had on conviction of their own, that they initiated reforms under pressure of public opinion here or under instructions from the people and the Government in England. That is what Lord Minto says. The same thing has Lord Curzon said. It means that the control of affairs, the direction of the administration, the right of initiative shall always be with the British people and their representatives here and not with any one else. It means, Sir, an open declartion by the present Viceroy that they are not amenable and they will never be amenable to Indian opinion in these matters." This is what I said, and the writer quotes from Lord Minto, the portion of the Budget Speech to which reference was made by me and after quoting it, he says that "no further explanation is required to show that the meaning attributed by Mr. Pal to the words contained in Lord Minto's speech is entirely foreign to the language used." I will appeal to you. I have interpreted Lord Minto's words according to the light that is in me, and I shall presently place the whole thing before you with a view to enable you to judge for yourself whether that interpretation has been inaccurate or misleading or otherwise. These are Lord Minto's words. "The Honourable Mr. Gokhale tempts me to fore-shadow the future," and he goes on to say, "I have deemed it all-important that the initiation of possible reforms should emanate from us. I have felt that nothing would be more mischievous to British administration in India in the future than a belief that its Government had acted on no conviction of their own but simply in submission to agitation in this country and in accordance with instructions conveyed to them from Home. If there has been misconceptions as to this, I hope I may be allowed this oppor-

tunity of correcting it." Now, I put it to you, gentlemen, did not I almost quote the words of Lord Minto ? The only interpretation that I put upon these words is identifying the meaning with the purpose of Lord Curzon, and I think I am right in doing so. Lord Minto says that it would be a mischievous thing for the Government of India in the future if the impression got abroad that they undertook possible reforms under pressure of agitation here. Its means this. I put it to you if this does not distinctly mean that the Government have got a conscience of their own. They will listen to that conscience, not to your voice. The Government have ideas of their own. They will govern you according to those ideas and not under pressure of agitation in India or England. What does it mean ? Does it not mean that the control, the direction, the right of initiation shall always rest with the Government of India and not with any body else (cries of yes), and, if that is the meaning, I put it to you, was not that the meaning also of Lord Curzon, was not that the meaning of Lord Curzon's memorable declaration in which he said that the Government of India, as long as it continues, to be British, certain offices must necessarily be occupied by the British. What are those offices, please ? Offices in which is vested the right of initiative, offices which control the administration, offices which initiate reform, and offices which dictate the policy of the Government. It is these offices which shall always continue to be in their hands, in the occupation of the British ; theirs is the controlling power, the power of dictating policy. These shall always rest with the Government, the foreign Government, with the respresentatives of the British people in India, with the Government as it is at present constituted and no part of this prerogative of the foreign Government in India shall be given to you (shame). I put it to you, Sir, (pointing to Mr. G. Subramania Aiyar), you presided on

the last occasion (turning to the Chairman) you are the master of the meeting to-day, and I put it to you all, gentlemen, whether I mislead you (cries of no), whether I put an inaccurate interpretation upon Lord Minto's utterances. Not even with regard to Lord Minto, would I try to put an inaccurate interpretation upon his sayings, for the simple reason, that the truth itself is so ugly that no inaccurate interpretation is needed to be put. (cries of Boycott the *Hindu*) no, no, do not boycott always. No, no, respect the *Hindu*, because you are a Hindu. No, it is a well-meant thing. Do not take offence at it. It is a friendly criticism. The thing is this, journalists have to do their work at electric speed (cry of Boycott the *Hindu*) I regret very much if any disrespectful remark is passed against the *Hindu*. It has been the only paper that has contributed to the making of Southern India. (Cries of *Swadesamitran*), my dear friends, *Swadesamitran* is the *Hindu* in the new incarnation.

The swaraj ideal.

Last night, I considered the ideal of *Swaraj*, but I am often times told why do you talk of the ideal. Swaraj is an excellent thing but it is not within the range of practical politics. It is an excellent academic subject, but not a subject which need trouble us very much so far as the actual work that we have to do is concerned. I do not, Mr. Chairman, I cannot subscribe to this view, and for this simple reason, unless you are sure as to what you want, you cannot adopt now the necessary means, the instruments for securing that which you want. You are walking, but walking is not progression. Walking may be away from the goal as well as it may be towards the goal and you ought to know what your destination is with a view to determine what your work and duty, what your direction must now be. Practical politics means the adoption of practical measures for the ameliora-

tion of the political condition of the people. But unless you have always a clear conception of the ultimate end, you run the risk of being carried away by the passions, the temptations, the prejudices, the difficulties, the obstacles of the hour, from your goal. Here is, for instance, a particular wrong that has to be remedied. Take, for instance, the misappropriation of a certain public fund by the Government—the misappropriation of the Famine Fund, the misappropriation in Bengal of the Road Cess Fund. When the Road Cess was first introduced in Bengal, it was regarded by the people of the Province as a practical violation of the Permanent Settlement obtaining in that country. It was a cess imposed upon land, and according to the terms of the Permanent Settlement, the Government had given the undertaking that no further assessment would be imposed upon land and yet this Road Cess was practically an impost on land, and the Government said no, it is not a part of Land Revenue. It is a special cess levied for a specific purpose, and accordingly they defined these purposes. They said that sinking wells, digging tanks, keeping and repairing and constructing public roads, looking after village sanitation, establishing a system of proper drainage in the village areas. These are all the objects to which this fund shall be applied. Laterly, however, they refused to grant any money out of this Road Cess fund for the removal of water scarcity in the rural areas of Bengal. They said, no, we will not give money for sinking wells or digging tanks. We shall spend it on other purposes. Here was a distinct misappropriation of public funds, and you may do at once one thing. You may appeal to the Government, you may memorialise to Government. You may bring friendly pressure upon the Government with a view to induce them to take to sinking wells, digging tanks and looking after village sanitation. If you do this, a particular

grievance will be removed. If the Government sink wells, dig tanks, water scarcity will be partially removed, and so far as it is removed the lot of the people will be easy. It will be some relief to the people, but the question is, will this temporary relief contribute to your progress towards a particular goal upon which you have set your heart. A school boy is running to his school. He is feeling very thirsty. He has got only one minute's time during which he has to get into his school. He is feeling thirsty. A man offers him a cool-drink, and says here is a cocoanut tree. I am going to the top of it and I shall give you a drink of a tender cocoa-nut, wait here. If the school-boy waits here, he will relieve his thirst, no doubt. He will find it very pleasant to have a drink of the tender cocoa-nut, but by going to enjoy a drink he will miss his lesson at his school; will he not? (cries of yes). Similarly, by seeking to relieve the present distress, you may be missing an opportunity of creating those forces in the community by the application of which, ultimately you may be able to attain *Swaraj* or autonomy. If you do not care for *Swaraj*, yes, Sir, let the partition be removed, let the cess be repealed, let a few more seats be given to us in the Legislative Councils. These are palliatives. These are local applications, and he is a quack doctor who, when the disease is a constitutional disease, wastes time by local application. In politics also, therefore, it is essential that you should know what it is that you desire to have. In the politics of free countries, the ultimate principles are well established. There the goal is kept in view, whatever party comes into power. The increase of the political power, the commercial prosperity of the British nation is the one end towards which Liberals or conservatives both equally try to move and lead the country. Therefore, the goal being fixed at that point there being no chance of misconception in the public mind

they are entitled to look after little things, to improve the details of the administration, to try palliatives, to make local applications for the removal of local maladies. But your malady is not a local malady. It is not the removal of one cess or another cess, it is not the securing of a few appointments here or a few honorary posts there. The evil under which you suffer is fundamental, a radical and a constitutional evil, and therefore it is the more necessary for you to keep this constitutional, this fundamental, this radical character of the problem that faces you, so that you may not run off from the right course by the passing temptations of the hour, this way or that way. I told you yesterday that when there is a conflict between the Government and the people, the right policy to follow for those who care for popular progress and popular freedom is to insist upon the Government, to adopt and follow the policy of *laissez faire*, to restrict the operation of the Government, to restrict the activities of the Government within the narrowest possible limits. But when you seek this isolated individual redress, the individual and isolated grievance, you do actually this. You increase the hold of the Government upon the mind of the people. I should rather wish, Sir, that our people went without good drinking water for 25 years, if that is necessary, I should think it far more desirable that, like the Israelites of old, the Indian people shall pass through the desert, parched up desert, for 25 years together drawing water at the end of the Prophet's rod out of hard stone rather than, have wells sunk and tanks dug by this foreign authority, who by distributing this water to you will captivate your heart. What is the real objective of the conflict between the educated community in this country and the Government. What is it, Sir, what is the objective of this conflict, that has been going on for the last quarter of a century

between the people, the representatives of the people, between the educated class, the enlightened class in India on the one hand and the foreign bureaucracy on the other. What is that objective? What is the citadel which both the parties are trying to capture and occupy? What is that top of the hold to which both the parties are trying to get up the soonest they can possibly do so? Is it merely the amendment of certain laws? Is it merely the removal of certain grievances? No. It is the heart, the mind of the people, of the masses that is the objective. Lord Curzon saw it, and all his measures were directed towards capturing the popular mind in India. He organised his pageants to appeal to the imagination of the man in the street. He has inaugurated Rural reforms, Agricultural Banks and other things with a view to captivate the mind of the teeming masses; and the intense scrupulousness with which he tried to do justice in cases of individual wrongs, in the punishment of the 9th Lancers, his desire to see British justice maintained in this country. All these things were directed towards one great end, and that end was a secure to themselves foreign bureaucracy for this alien administration in this country, if not the allegiance, at least the passive, the generous acquiescence of the general mass of the population (hear, hear), and the battle must be waged around that citadel. The Government will try to capture the mind of the masses and he is a foolish politician in India who allows the Government to capture the mind of the masses to the exclusion of his own influence, of his own countrymen (cheers). And what do you do if you make the administration easy? What do you do if you cover the veil of the British administration with cotton and wool. It moves on and it grinds us small, but the padded wool makes it less painful to you. That is all. Good Government is not only no substitute for self-government, it is

an exceedingly evil thing when the authority of the State rests in the hands of an irresponsible power. Of all kinds of despotism, a benevolent despotism is the worst, because the benevolence makes people acquiesce in the despotism, and it is therefore necessary that you and I should have a clear vision of what we want. Do you want good government, Sir. If you want good government you can have it. You will have it. Things will be made easy for you, but if you want self-government under existing conditions in India, good government would be absolutely opposed to the promotion of self-government, because, as I said last night, our trouble is with ourselves. Our trouble is with our own mind. Our trouble is with our own sentiments. Our trouble is with our own wills, with our own inertia, and good government will help to continue if it does not increase the *Maya*. Pleasures of the world increase the hold of *Maya* on human beings, and it is therefore he who wants to get rid of Maya is asked to cultivate *vairagya*, cultivate abstemiousness, cultivate disattachment. You talk of swaraj. The knowledge of swaraj is absolutely impossible without a consciousness of the present *pararashtra* The knowledge of self is absolutely impossible unless the self comes in contact and conflict with the not-self. So the knowledge of *Swaraj* is absolutely impossible unless there is not a *pararashtra*. *Para* is directly against the *Swara*. It is in the conflict between *Swara* and *Para*, it is in the conflict between the self and the not-self, in political affairs, with the conception of the real. Self-Government grows and keen has become the conflict between the self and the not-self. In political matters as strong in proportion to this keenness becomes the desire of *Swaraj*. Therefore, the conflict must be kept up and good government helps to kill and not to keep up this conflict between the self and the not-self, in the political affairs of a country consti-

tuted as India is. Therefore you must have a clear conception of what you want. *Swaraj* your *raj*, your *Shastra*, and the first is, as in Vedantic culture the first thing is *nithaya vasthu vichara viveka*, improve the self and not improve the not-self. That is, discrimination is the very first thing in Vedantic culture, the very first thing in the culture of the ideal of the *Swaraj*. Discrimination in political and civic matters between the national self and that which is not the national self. The ideal of Swaraj has been revealed to us only recently, and, why, because for nearly a hundred years and more we never looked upon the British Government in India as a *pararashtra*, as a foreign Government. When the Congress was started we looked upon this Government as our government, only it was not so good as we should like it to be. Before that we regarded this Government as our Government because we had been brought up under English ideals, brought up in English traditions. Not only have our territories been conquered by England, but by this English education even our mind, our mental ideals, our ethical ideals, our spiritual aspirations, all these had been got hold of by this foreign Government, this foreign culture, this foreign civilisation. And because we found or we fancied that we found in this foreign Government until our better, our higher, our superior self, that which we ought to become to-morrow which we are not to-day, simply because we looked upon this Government and their institutions in this light, there was no possibility of the growth of the conception of *swaraj* in our midst. In proportion as there grew a conflict first in the political field, then in the field of religion, in the field of Social Reform, in the field of economics, all over the national life, in proportion as there grew in the consciousness of the Indian people the presence of a conflict between ourselves and those who govern the country, between ourselves and the British

people, in proportion as this conflict grew in that proportion by slow degrees grew this ideal of *Swaraj* until the conflict grew almost unbearable. The full revolution of the ideal of Swaraj came to us after the departure of Lord Curzon from this country and was proclaimed by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji from the chair of the Congress last year (cheers). If this be so, if this be a fact, sir, that applying the principles of psychology to the consideration of our political problems, if we find that it is necessary that we should recognise this conflict between the people and the Government, it is also necessary that we should do nothing that will make this Government easy for us, because if the Government becomes easy, if it becomes pleasant, if it becomes good government, then our sense of separation from it will be gradually lost, and when the sense of separation is lost *Smrithi Brahamsath Budhi nasa, budhi nasath pranasyathi*, &c. You contemplate all the good things that this Government can do for you, you meditate on the honours that the Government can shower on you, you meditate on the high offices whcih the Government may give you. You may get the High Court Judgeship here, a Membership of the Legislative Council there, an Advocate-Generalship in another part of the globe, a Legal Remembrancer in a third place, an executive membership of the Council possibly again. Now you think of all this, and thinking of all this you feel an attachment for this, and feeling an attachment for this, you desire to have this, and the feeling of this desire to have this, kills your consciousness of separation from this. And therefore good Government, pleasant Government, pleasurable associations with the Government, whatever else, however moderate or temperat , may be, they can never make for *Swaraj*, because the first thing in *Swaraj* is the perception of this, that there is an eternal, a natural conflict between the self and the not-self in

political affairs in this country. It is for this reason that I always tried to impress the ideal of *Swaraj* upon my countrymen, because once you have the ideal before you it will be possible for you to judge of the particular methods or measures in the light of that ideal. Do you want an expansion of the Legislative Council? Let us see if it will help you for *Swaraj*. Do you want that a few Indians shall sit as your representatives in the House of Commons? Let us see if half-a-dozen, or a dozen, or two dozens or 40, 50 members in the House of Commons representing the interests of India elected by the Indian leaders, will make or not make for Swaraj. Do you want a larger number of Indians to be in the Civil Service of the Government? Let us see whether 50, 60, 100, 200, or 300 Civilians will make the Government our own. At one time we thought, Sir, that this was the method. At one time we thought that by slow degrees by participating in a small measure in the work of the administration with the Government of the country, with the foreign rulers of the land, we shall not only be trained in discharging rightly and properly the duties of the administration, but we shall also gradually oust them, replace the English agency by Indian agency. What, Sir, if you replace the agency? What about the principal? He is the primary factor and we, his agents. The whole Civil Service might be Indian, but the Civil Servants have to carry out orders. They cannot direct. They cannot dictate policy. The policy is dictated by those who stand above them; and you replace, as I have said, the agency, but the agency implies presence of an original, a principal, and if, instead of 200, 300, 2,000 Englishmen being the agents of the British nation and the British Parliament in India for the Government of India, you have 2,000 natives, will that alter the state of things? (No) I know it will not. We have had a number of Indian civilians. Have they altered, at any rate, the character, the

nature, the tradition of British Government in India? We have just now in Bengal an Indian Civilian who is the Senior Member of the Board of Revenue. But one swallow does not make a summer, and one Civilian, 100 or 1,000 civilians in the service of the British Government will not make that Government Indian. There are traditions, there are laws, there are principles, there are policies to which every Civilian, be he black, brown or white, must submit, and as long as these traditions have not been altered, as long as these principles have not been amended, as long as that policy has not been radically changed, the supplanting of European by Indian agency will not make for self-government in this country. I doubt it very much whether it would make for good Government either. Why? You seem to think that a larger number of appointments in the Civil Service or in the Subordinate Service will improve the administration. I deny that it will be so, and it is for this simple reason. An Englishman, whatever else his fault is, is trained in the free atmosphere of England. An Englishman, whatever may be his attitude towards you and me, still knows this, he can stand upon his own rights. He never bends his knees unjustly, cringingly, after the manner of the sycophant even before the highest official superior; but can you say the same of your Indian Civil Servants? (No.) And why?, because the Indian Civil Servant knows there is no one behind his back to support him. The English Civil Servant knows there is behind his back the public opinion of England, the freedom of England, to stand him in good stead. Our Police is corrupt, and they sometimes say, "Oh! What a perfect officer the Policeman in London is." Transplant the London Policeman in India and see where his perfection goes; and what is the reason? Why is it, the London Police is so honest, so painstaking, so respectful to the rights and liberties of people

of London? Because he knows that he is the servant of the public of London. In India every red turban knows and feels that he is not your servant but he is your master. And why does he feel it? Because he receives his *sannad* not from your hands but from the hands of the foreign rulers of the land. It is to him that the Policeman is responsible and not to you. It is to him the Civil Servant is responsible and not to you. It is to him that the District Magistrate is responsible and not to you. It is to him that the Inspector is responsible and not to you; and therefore, the Inspector, the Civilian, the District Magistrate and the Police constable and every officer of the Government in fact looks to his own interest naturally, and looking to his own interest he sees that, if he can please the officials, his interest will be best served, and if he displeases you he will not in the least suffer in his own interest. Therefore, there is such weakness, inefficiency, such disregard of the rights, liberties and the privileges of the people in the service of the Government in this country. Therefore, I say, if you have a larger number of officials, native officials that may make things easy for a few families, get a few more coffers into their chest than otherwise, perhaps, they would get. It might make things easy for a few individuals, but for the nation at large it will not improve their lot. It is, therefore, necessary, I say, from whatever point of view you look upon this question you will find that the consideration of the ideal, the creation of right conception, the creation of strong convictions in regard to the goal, is essentially necessary for the right conduct and management of what you call practical politics. It is said, Sir, are you fit for *Swaraj*. I put the question of fitness entirely out of Court, because I am not going to apply to anybody else for granting me Swaraj. It is only when you

have to make an application to somebody else to give you a certain thing that you have to prove your fitness for getting it. When you have to make an application to the Registrar of the High Court for a clerkship in the High Court or to the Police Magistrate there for some office at his disposal, you have to say "Sir, Being given to understand that a clerkship is vacant, I beg to apply myself as a candidate for the same." And then you have to say "as regards my qualification, I have passed F.A. or B.A. examination of the Madras University" but I say that when you want to open a shop with your own money, or the money left to you by your father or grandfather, do you in any application say you are qualified or not. Why not? Because you do it yourself. Therefore, you are not called upon to prove your fitness for the thing before you do it before anybody else, and those who ask us to prove our fitness for *Swaraj* forget that we have abjured a programme of petitions and prayers for good. They forget that we do not ask, nay, not even the benign Government of Britain in India, to grant us *Swaraj*. We do not pray to them for these things; and I would say more, Sir, if the Government were to come and tell me to-day 'take *Swaraj*' I would say, 'thank you for the gift', but I will not have that which I cannot acquire by my own hand, (cries of *Bande Mataram*)—because my dear friends, in real growth, which is organic growth, there is absolutely no room for gift. Evolution whether in the case of individuals or of nations admits of no gifts from outside. We must grow from within, and I am surprised to find, Sir, that those eminently prudent and wise gentlemen, who, the moment we talk of social reform come up to us and say 'Oh, social reform must be a growth from within', when we talk of *Swaraj* they call us to prove our fitness. They take it for granted that we must get it from outside. If social reform

is to be a growth from within, I accept it unreservedly. There can be no reform, social or economic or political, that can be got from outside. You must gradually acquire your rights and in the acquisition of your right you develop your character, you equip yourself with these forces and resources which will enable you to protect and to use those rights properly when you have got them. Lord Ripon's generous scheme of Local Self-Government has been a failure, more or less, I should say, out of regard for the tender susceptibilities of our Municipal Commissioners and Local Board Members. And why has it not succeeded, Sir? Simply because it was a gift from the Government. If we have grown into it, if we had acquired it by our own strength, if we had organised our village lives ourselves, if we had organised our Municipal life ourselves, if we had organised our taluka life ourselves, why, Local Self-Government would take its stand upon self-determination, self-exertion, self-recognition of the civic duties by the peoples themselves. Such a Local Self-Government would not be a mushroom growth, would not be like an orchid that has no root on the ground but hangs on the tree of a foreign government. It will not be like that. The partial or complete failure of the schemes of Local Self-Government inaugurated by Lord Ripon proves my contention that for the exercise of civic rights it is essentially necessary that the people should desire to exercise those rights, should acquire them, and in the acquisition of these rights they prove their fitness for the exercise of these rights. It is foolish politics, excuse me for that expression, to demand *a priori* reason and argument for proving the fitness of the people for Self-Government. No man knows, no one can say, that a nation is fit for Self-Government or is not. The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof, and the proof of the fitness of the people is in their capacity to

achieve the institution of Self-Government by their own exertion, by their own strength, by their own combination, by their own determination and by their own sacrifice themselves (cries of *Bande Mataram*).

And because this is so, our programme is that we shall so work in the country, so combine the resources of the people, so organise the forces of the nation, so develop the instincts of freedom in the community, that by this means we shall—*shall* in the imperative—compel the submission to our will of any power that may set itself against us. Then, they ask, what you talk of *Swaraj*, would it be a Hindu *Swaraj* or a Mahomedan *Swaraj* ? What would be the form of your *Swaraj?* My reply here, again, is this. It is impossible for any man to lay down beforehand what the particular form of a thing that is passing through a process of evolution will be. Evolution implies heredity and environment, certain original powers, capabilities and the possibilities in the organism that is being evolved, and the action and reaction of these capabilities on its environments, and as our environments will be, so our form also will necessarily be. It will depend upon what lines the historic evolution of modern India takes to determine what will be the particular form of the *Swaraj* that will be established in this country. France started her revolution with the noble ideal of equality, fraternity and humanity. France raised the flag of democracy at the beginning of the Revolution, and no man held that flag morg high than did Napolean Bonaparte, and yet in the course of a few months it was found out that France would not realise even her own ends through setting up a republic or democratic form of Government When all the royalties of Europe, when all the European Powers combined together to crush this rising republic of France, France had necessarily

to develop a dictatorship, had necessarily to develop an absolute and military form of Government with a view to meet the exigencies of the situation created by the combination of the European Powers against her. France did not wish. It was of necessity imposed upon France by the circumstances of her case. Who knows what dire necessity may be imposed upon you and me by the circumstances of our case in the progress of the evolution of our political life in the future. We know it not, but so far as our ideal is concerned, we need not hesitate to make this declaration, that the *Swaraj* of ours is not merely the Hindu, not merely the Mahomedan, nor merely the Christian *Swaraj*, but the *Swaraj* of every Child of India, Hindu or Christian or Mahomedan, the *Swaraj* will be the *Swaraj* of the Indian yeople, not of any section of it.

The ideal of Swaraj that has revealed itself to us is the ideal of divine democracy. It is the ideal of democracy, higher than the fighting, the pushing, the materialistic, I was going to say, the cruel democracy of Europe and America. There is a higher message still : men are gods and the equality of Indian democracy is the equality of the divine original, the divine nature, the divine possibilities and the divine destiny of every individual being, be he Hindu, or Mahomedan, Buddhist or Christian. It is on account of this general training of the India people in the past whether they be Hindu or Mahomedan, it is on account of this spiritual emphasis of the Hindu character and the generality also of the Indian character that we have had the supreme privilege of seeing before us the revolution of a democratic ideal, superior to that which has as yet been revealed to the general concionsness of European humanity. This is our Swaraj. Our Swaraj will not be Hindu or Mahomedan ; it will be an Indian Swaraj. You, and I,

the meanest of men, to whatever caste, to whatever community or denomination, the Indian may belong, we will form an organic element of the big *Swa* whose *raj* we desire to set up and attain in this country. But, Sir, though this may be our ideal, we know not under what particular historical constitutions we may have to reach and realise this ideal. If it be so, that what happened in France is repeated in India also, I believe ours shall be a peaceful revolution,—absolutely peaceful. There is no parallel in the history of a people inhabiting such a vast continent as India and counting such a large number as 300 millions and more governed by a handful of representatives by a small country far across the seas whose whole population cannot bear any reasonable proportion to the population of the country that they govern. History has not seen a nation of such a vast mass of humanity being governed absolutely and despotically by a handful of alien people, and therefore the constitution being unique, unprecedented, history affords no help to us for our guidance. It will not do, my dear friends, for you simply to read history, you will have to make, to work out the history of India yourself; and, therefore, I believe what has never happened in the history of the world may yet happen, in the history of India, *viz*, that a popular revolutionary propaganda may attain its end absolutely by passive means and methods. But still no man knoweth which way the force of circumstances will lead his feet, so we know not, but if we are prompted by the Grace of God to work out a peaceful revolution in India we can picture to ourselves what the future form of our Swaraj will be. It will be as Sir Henry Cotton,—no doubt, in a slightly different sense, because he is an Englishman and not an Indian,—declared at the Bombay Congress. It was a prophetic declaration, *viz*., that the future Government of India

will be the United States of India. All prophetic declarations are in their very nature unconscious. No declaration can be a prophetic declaration unless it is an unconscious declaration, and I am sure Sir Henry Cotton was not conscious of the implication in that declaration, the United States of India. But he made that declaration—under the ægis of Great Britain. We may leave the ægis for a while; the ægis is there and I told you last night, as long as it is there, United States of India will be a divided nationality of India. But whatever that may be our ideal is the United States of India. But the United States of India will not be like the United States of America. Some of our provinces themselves that are under British administration now will be republican. Those that are under Native Chiefs will be constitutional monarchies. We cannot set up republics in Mysore. We would not try to set it up and create difficulties in our way. We cannot set up republics in the Nizam's dominions. We would not try it and create difficulties. We cannot set up republics in Baroda or Patiala. These Native States must remain as principalities, monarchical States, but the popular rights must be respected there; otherwise they would not form States of the great Indian Union. And this is our ideal. This is of course, a mere fancy. I am trying to consider the problem of historical possibilities and nothing else. What is the possibility before the country, and the consideration of historical possibilities. I think there are lawyers here who will say it falls outside the range of Section 124A: not that I am afraid of that Section (hear, hear) because I believe that, as in ancient India, why ancient only 100 years back, when we had the customs of *sati* in our midst, no woman was permitted to ascend the funeral pyre of her husband until she has proved her capacity to be burnt without flinching, by burning one of her fingers in the presence of her relatives, as

this test was necessary, the question of the fear of pain and burning was a precondition for the woman ascending the pyre,) so the conquest of fear of Section 124. A and 153. A (cheers), is an essential precondition of the man who would step forward to lead the life of a publicist in India under existing conditions. But, gentlemen, whatever that may be, the historical possibilities that present themselves before us are not many. There is this possibility of an United States of India. But if there should be a conflict we do not desire it, we do not expect it, we will not create it (hear, hear); but if there should be a conflict and a most inevitable one, between the forces of the people and the forces of Government, then who knows what will be. Then, perhaps, we too may have to pass through some medium stage before we can reach the ideal of *Swaraj* because concentration of forces would be necessary, and in political life democracy is not best suited. Therefore we may not directly reach the democratic ideal. It may be that we shall have to work it out through some medium stage, and I refer to it for this simple reason to give an assurance to my Mahomedan friends, because if we fail to directly reach our democratic ideal, when the Mahomedan or Hindu will equally share in the rights of self-government, if we fail to realise this ideal directly, and if the necessities are imposed upon us of concentrating the forces of the nation and setting up a dictatorship as they did in France, then look about you and see if there is any man in India, or any possibility of any one in India, being found to undertake this dictatorship. I hope the necessity will not arise; but if the necessity arises there is a dreamer of dreams in the near neighbourhood of India and he is a Mussalman. I think Ameer Habibulla has got his head on his shoulders and he sees further than many of our leaders seem to do. And it is

not merely out of love for the Anglo-Indian life that he proposes to pay a domiciliary visit next year to India (Hear, hear and laughter). He seems to be a politician of the first water as was proved by his declaration that the Hindus and the Mussalmans in India having lived together in peace and amity for so many centuries, they ought to live in the same peace and amity now. (Hear, hear). But these are vain imaginings. Let us not indulge in these fancies even though they be of historical imagination. The fact really is, my dear friends, that the condition of India is such that we hope to attain our *Swaraj* by the most peaceful methods possible. If you ask me what are those methods, I can only say that I cannot give you a cut and dried plan of our work. No man can do so. He who says that he can give a cut and dry plan of his work and methods in politics, especially in politics of the kind in which we are engaged at the present time in India, with all respect to that man, I will say he has not applied himself properly to a consideration of the actual problem before himself, and his country. Politics, Sir, is a game of chess. It is a game of chess in international politics. It is a game of chess in national politics also; and what a fool is he who sitting down to play a game of chess with a powerful and acute and farsighted opponent can foresee and foretell every move that he makes without knowing the move of the other party. Our move shall be determined by their move; if they put forward a Pawn and make room for their Knight we shall have to put forward our Bishop and make it impossible to the Knight to come and occupy the place of the Pawn. Just as their move will be, so must our move be, and as we do not know what their move will be to-morrow, we cannot say what our move may be to-morrow. So far in Bengal we have been engaged these two years and more in a very beautiful game of chess. The partition measure was

the first move of the Government (Laughter). It was prompted by the desire to kill, nay, the king cannot be killed, to checkmate the growing political power of the Bengali people. First of all we prayed, we petitioned, we protested, but all to no purpose. And when we saw that the Government will not listen to our prayers we put forward our small proposal of boycott. (Laughter and cheers). They laughed at us. They had never known the Bengalis to possess the strength and determination and therefore they thought, it was mere gas; it will easily evaporate (laughter); it is like the explosion of the sodawater bottle which will harm nobody. Only you let out the gas confined in the bottle, but within two months they began to scratch their head. On the lucky day, the 4th day of the Dasara Festival and the last day of the Durga Puja, on that day it had been the custom in Calcutta for the Marwaris to enter into forward contracts with the agents of Manchester at Calcutta to the extent of many lakhs of rupees, but on the lucky day in 1905 October, not a single forward contract for Manchester goods was made. (Cries of *Vande Mataram*). That proved that the situation was more serious than gaseous; and the Government began to consider ways and means to meet this serious situation. They saw that the strength of boycott lay very largely in our young College-going population. (Hear, hear and cheers). They saw that it was these young men who by that persuasive eloquence which is the greatest strength of well-regulated youth, they saw that our young men by the strength of their natural persuasive eloquence compelled people to desist from buying foreign goods. The story has been told that on one occasion a high class Bengali lady was going in her coach and pair to Whiteaway Laidlaw's shop. The boys got scent of the affair and they went and placed themselves before the coach and they were asked to get out of the way; they joined their

hands and said, "Mother, you are like our mother. We are like your sons. Do not go to Whiteaway Laidlaw." She said—" No, No ; Coachman clear the road." Then they said, " Madam, if you are determined to go and buy foreign things of Whiteaway Laidlaw, we are determined to be crushed under the wheel of your carriage (laughter and cheers) before we shall allow the carriage to pass near the door of Whiteaway Laidlaw." What woman, what mother could resist such an appeal and the lady asked her coachman to drive her back home, (Cheers). This is the general method that our young men adopted for helping this boycott. This was the sort of picketting in which they engaged themselves for furthering this boycott. The Government saw it ; the leaders had not the time ; their age and the infirmities of the age would not allow them to do picketting work of this kind, and the Government saw that these young men contributed to the strength of the boycott and the Carlyle circular was moved out. (Shame). In that circular it was made penal for school and College-going youngmen to be engaged in picketting work ; it was made penal for school and College young men to take part in political demonstrations ; it was made penal for young people reading in schools and Colleges even to cry out *Vande Mataram*, (Shame). The Government thought that by threatening our boys with expulsion from College and University, they would bring their leaders down to their knees (Cries of Never). The Carlyle circular was published in the *Statesman* on a Sunday morning. On Tuesday, within 60 hours of the publication of the circular, we called a public meeting in Calcutta. At that meeting the President, Mr Rasul, of the Calcutta Bar, declared in reply to the Carlyle circular, that we would have a National University of our own. (Hear, hear and cheers). The Carlyle circular was their little Pawn and we placed before it the Knight of National University. They

actually punished our boys. In Rangpur the boys were fined, the whole school was fined. The boys refused to submit to this punishment, and the guardians of the boys supported them in this matter (hear, hear). And within a week or so of the infliction of these punishments and the consequent expulsion of boys from the Rangpur School, the National school was established in Rangpur. The Government next saw that Carlyle circulars would not do. They brought out the Goorkha sticks (cries of shame), the Gurkha clubs, excuse me. (Cries of shame). Do not cry shame. They are doing exactly what is needed in their interest. Give them credit for common humanity. The Goorkha club was brought out, the Barisal outrage was committed, the earlier outrage. Why, Sir? people seem to have understood the inwardness of that policy. Many people opposed Fuller for it. I never opposed him for the simple reason that he was not responsible for what took place in East Bengal under his *regime*. In Barisal, what happened? Barisal had taken to boycott more earnestly than any other district in Bengal. In the town of Barisal there is an European, the Manager of the Nawab of Dacca's property. His name is Meyers. He wanted a piece of bleached Manchester cloth, a piece of mull. He sent his boy to the bazaar. No man would sell a piece of *belati* cloth in the bazaar of Barisal. Meyers appealed to the District Superintendent of Police. He sent his Constable to the bazaar to get a piece of mull, foreign mull, for Mr. Meyers. The shopkeepers refused to sell foreign mull. The D. S. P. reported the matter to the District Magistrate. The District Magistrate wrote a letter to Aswini Kumar Dutta and the letter was something like this. He said, "My dear Aswini Kumar Datta, What is it that Mr, Meyers cannot get a piece of foreign cloth in the Barisal bazaar? I am told that no man will sell a piece of foreign mull without a permit from you. Will you kindly give

a permit to the bearer for a piece of foreign mull for the use of Mr. Meyers." He gave a permit because Meyers was an English-man and Meyers had his mull, but what became, sir, of the prestige of British authority in Barisal. That proved that Aswani Kumar Dutta had become a greater power in the eye of his people than the representatives of King Edward himself. The situation was serious, exceedingly serious. If there be any landed proprietor here, he will understand the seriousness of the situation in Barisal so far as the Government is concerned, because every landed proprietor knows that if one man in his village becomes more powerful than his own agent he tries to check him, in order to prove before all the villagers that he is a man of straw. So Government had to prove it to Barisal that Aswani Kumar Dutta and those leaders who had worked were men of straw. When this thing happened, Fuller was in East Bengal. He had some bad experience before also. I happened to be associated with one of these things. Fuller went to Dacca on Sunday and was met with great trouble and beating of tom tom by less than 500 men. • The students left the city and went on picnic 3 miles distant from the town with a view to avoid welcoming the Lieutenant-Governor. But the next day, on Monday, I happened to go to Dacca from Mymensingh, and when I arrived at the station, I found 5,000 men gathered there to receive me (cries of *Vande Mataram*); it showed the spirit of the people, the determination of the people of East Bengal, to give greater recognition to their own men than to a Governor that had been forced upon their heads. So Fuller when he had received intimation of the state of things in Barisal, he took down train to Agra. Lord Curzon was in Agra then and they put their heads together and dictated the policy that Fuller carried out later on. It was from Agra that the telegram was sent to Assam calling up the Gurkha Military Police to Barisal, and at

Barisal when Fuller went he invited Aswani Kumar Dutt to his board the steamer and there insulted the whole lot of them (Cries of shame).No, no. What is the meaning of it. The meaning of it was this. Sir B. Fuller had to prove it to the people of Bengal that the man on whom they depended, the man on whom they looked forward to was a straw before the breath of the governing power. That was what he wanted to show; and why were the Gurkhas let loose upon inoffensive people. [Shame] No, no. It was clear it was a declaration to the people, it was a demonstration to the people of Barisal of their utter helplessness to protect themselves against the wrath of the Government. Every Gurkha outrage was a challenge to the people of Barisal to call upon their leaders to protect them. It meant this. You boycotted British goods, because Aswani Kumar Dutta wanted you to do so. Call him and let him protect you from the outrage. Now, what was the meaning of what was done in Barisal, and what did we do; we gradually worked; we lay low for a while. These things had to be adopted in life and for a while we did lie low. But after a while what did happen. The Government had thought to demoralise the Barisal people by the application of Gurkha sticks. The nation refused to be demoralised. (Hear, hear). And then at Barisal during the conference they played the same game. They tried to prove the utter helplessness of the whole leaders of Bengal and what happened. They found that there was a strength in the people, the existence of which had never been dreamt of by them. We did not beat them; we did not mean to do them any harm, but I think there is proof of a greater strength in desisting to reply to an unjust outrage sometimes than in replying to that outrage. To beat a man when you were beaten is not always easy. But sometimes I think it is easy to allow yourselves to be beaten instead of beating

him back, and it happened in Barisal. When the police applied their sticks upon the boys, not a man moved, every man kept to his place. I was coming back, because this outrage was started after some of us had gone a few paces ahead. Surendranath Bannerji led the procession, (laughter and cheers). We were moving out in three files deep leaving half the road absolutely free for the general traffic. This was the object of the Police; this was the object with which it is required that people carrying or conducting a procession through crowded thoroughfares, should demand a license from the authorities so that the traffic in the streets may not be interfered with, and though we did not take out a license, we kept half the street free for ordinary traffic. But that was our offence—walking in quiet military order—that was our offence. But they did not touch us. The instructions were not to touch those, who were regarded more or less as leaders of the people. The instruction was evidently to beat those whose names were not known to the country, so that by leaving the leaders scot free and beating the following crowd, a sentiment would be created among the friends and relations against these leaders. That was the game that they were playing. And an assault was started when we had gone a few paces a head. When we heard, we turned our back. I was going back; when I came near the culvert leading from the Rajah Bahadur Haveli, I saw the processionists standing shoulder to shoulder in the middle of the culvert. The Police made a charge before my eyes. A stick fell on the head of a man. He fell down flat upon the culvert. The others would not, but three men—one man stepped forward to hold the head of the man who had fallen down, another man got hold of his feet, and the third man got hold of his loins and carried him away, and the gap that was made was immediately closed. There was no cowardice, there was not the least desire to avoid

being beaten. There was a bravery, a courage like the hidden powers of a volcano, and the Government was taken aback. They thought that the sight of the stick would disperse a Bengalee crowd. But when a Bengalee crowd allowed itself to be beaten in this way without moving an inch, they thought there must be something behind the Bengalee nation. Are they manufacturing arms and ammunition somewhere? That was what some foolish official asked; but every one saw that there had grown up in the Bengalees a determination which it would not be easy to acquire. After the Barisal incident we showed the strength of our determination to suffer. We openly declared that we would not suffer these outrages any more. In Mymensingh a public meeting was advertised. I was there then. On the day the meeting was to be held, the leader of the Mymensingh Bar sent for the Police Inspector to the Bar Library and told him we are having a public meeting to-day. If you come there as a respectable citizen you are welcome to do so. If you come with warrants to arrest any of us, no resistance will be offered to you or even without a warrant if you peacefully and lawfully come to arrest any of us, not the least resistance will be offered in the discharge of your public duty; but if you come in the name of law with your regulation stick to break our heads, heads will be broken on both sides. We had our meeting, and Babu Ananth Bandu Saho presided, and in his speech from the chair he repeated what I have said before the whole assembly. We did the same thing here and there. They had proscribed the cry of *Bande Mataram* in Bengal. They had by a circular prohibited and made it illegal to cry out *Bande Mataram* in public streets. What did our people do, and mostly young people. It was illegal and punishable to cry in a street. All right! When a Policeman or a European officer passed by the street

young people would jump out of the street, cross the drain and come to private ground and cry out *Bande Mataram.* That was absolutely legal. By this means we brought down the prestige of the Government in Bengal in the estimation of the people. I have recited all these things simply to tell you that our moves at every step had to be determined by the moves of the Government. I have told all these series of things that happened in Bengal during the past year simply with a view to prove that the game in which we are engaged just now is a game of chess and our moves are always determined by what move the Government makes, but a game of chess is played with 32 figures, and it is placed within the limits of 64 squares. The game of politics in which we are engaged will have to be played by 300 millions of figures and more, and the squares are almost infinite in number. Therefore, although it may be possible to figure before yourself every possible move that your Pawn may make, you can do so only when the possibilities range within 64 squares. You cannot do it when the possibilities are almost infinite. Therefore, dear friends, our methods, our ways and means shall always be determined by the methods, by the ways and means adopted by those who are playing against us in this great national and political game. I cannot give you a cut and dry programme. I deem it the height of folly in any man to demand a cut and dry programme in a matter of this kind. I have presented to you the ideal in general terms. I have spoken to you of the possibilities of the future historic development of India. I have indicated to you briefly the nature of the game that the Government is playing, and I have also given you some idea of the way that we are playing our own part of the game as against our opponents. I cannot give you a clearer idea of our ways and means, but there are one or two general questions that may

we ll be discussed, and if you ask me to state in general terms what are the methods, what are the means, what are the instruments by which you hope to further this ideal of *Swaraj* in this country, my reply shall be that these means and methods are included under what is known in political science as methods of passive resistance. Passive resistance is not the antonym of active resistance. There can be no resistance which is not an active resistance. Even the determination to allow a man to beat you is something of the activity of the will power in you. There can be no resistance which is not the act of something. What then does passive resistance mean. It means not resistance that is not active resistance, but resistance that is not aggressive resistance. Passive resistance is not non-active but non-aggressive resistance. We stand upon our own rights. We stand within the limits of the law that we have still in the country. We shall respect that law, as I said yesterday, as long as that law shall respect our primary rights which constitute the authority of every Government, whether that Government be a despotic Government or a constitutional Government, but rights which no Government can create, and which, therefore, no Government can destroy. As long as the laws of this Government respect our primary rights of life or person, property and other similar primary rights, so long we propose to keep ourselves within the bounds of law; and passive resistance means resistance offered by a people from within the limits of such law. That is in general terms our method. The broad application of this method of passive resistance has brought out two or three special movements in India. One movement is the boycott movement. It is a movement of passive resistance. The other movement is the movement of National Education, and the third movement is the movement for the organisation of our

public life, building it up from our village life, and by these three means, Boycott, National education and Swadeshi included in the boycott, and by the organisation of the forces and the resources of the people and by setting up a scheme of practical self-government running parallel to the officialised institutions of self-government in the country to find a school of civic duties for the people by this means we hope, God willing, to achieve our end without any serious trouble, without any serious discomforts to those who are placed in authority above us. These are, broadly speaking, our methods. The question of Boycott both as an economic movement and as a political movement, it will not be possible for me to consider at the close of an address which has extended, I believe, already to more than two hours. Neither can I consider to-night the question of National education, nor do I desire at the fag end of my address to-night to tell you what we are doing and how we are doing it with a view to organise the public life of Bengal, with a view to set up a system of real self-government independent of the Government institutions, of local self-government in the country. These things, God willing, I shall consider on another occasion.

Boycott.

(Fourth Lecture.)

Mr. Chairman and Friends.—On Friday night in closing my address on the ways and means for the attainment of *Swaraj* I referred in general terms to the movement known as that, of passive resistance, and I tried to explain as briefly as I could, what passive resistance meant. It means this. I will repeat it briefly again. It means that we shall keep ourselves within the bounds of law in asserting the will of the nation against the great political wrong—why political—against the great wrong economically, politically, morally and even spiritually that the domination of one people over another universally inflicts. In carrying out a programme of passive resistance it should be our endeavour always to keep ourselves in the right, and to place those who may be opposed to us at every step, in the wrong. That is a thing which will always have to be borne in mind, and it is this characteristic of the movement in Bengal that has sown consternation into the councils of the mighty. Our boys, our youngman, our old men, they have always scrupulously been on the offensive. They have always kept themselves within the bounds of law. The Courts of law may have condemned them, but they are not always guided by considerations of law. Considerations of public policy sometimes in every country and not very rarely in India, control the verdict of our public Courts. No conviction, no promotion has been a notorious principle in the administration of Criminal justice by the subordinate Judiciary in more than one Province in India ; and that being so it is not at all surprising that the Courts of law should have declared certain acts of our people here and there as trespassing beyond the

limits of law, and they may have sent some of our men to jail for alleged breach of the law, but these judgments in many cases if they are published along with the records of evidence will not carry conviction to an impartial public. So, sir, all through our campaign of passive resistance in Bengal it has been our earnest endeavour to keep ourselves within the limits of law, and by this self-restraint by this very regard in our determination to oppose the despotic will of the present Government, by this very regard for the laws of that Government we have to a very large extent made them powerless. This is a matter which you are always to bear in mind in carrying on a programme of passive resistance. An Anglo-Indian characterised the methods of the new party as are explained to you by me as unconstitutional. I wish the writer had either read or understood what I had said on this point in my previous address. I have never either through the columns of my paper, *New India* or from the public platform advocated as yet any form of lawlessness, and yet this honest journalist (cries of shame and boycott it) says that I will have nothing to do with constitutional agitation in India, because as I said, India is not a constitutional Government (Hear, hear). But there are laws even in India, and I hold that our agitation should continue to be as it has been in the past. Our agitation should continue to be in the future lawful so far as the laws of the Government did not violate the primary rights of man (Hear, hear and cheers). I know not, Sir, what more clear and definite declaration could possibly be made by any one in a matter of this kind, and if, after this declaration, the charge is repeated to mislead our moderate friends, I care not for others (Hear, hear) ; if the charge is repeated to mislead our moderate friends that we advocate lawlessness, it will be done no longer through ignorance or misconception, but

through deliberate dishonesty. (Laughter and cheers and cries of shame). Keep then, my dear friends, keep yourselves within the right, and by being yourself in the right always, put those who oppose you in the wrong, and I say this especially, because it has been said here and there that there has grown up something like an offensive spirit in the people of Madras in consequence of my utterances (no, no, not at all). I do not ask you to sacrifice under any condition your national self-respect. But I do ask you to cultivate strength, determination, fixity of purpose, and when you have strength, cultivate self-respect (Hear, hear). There is no self-restraint unless there be strength. The self-restraint of the weak is an unreal something. It is not a virtue. It is no self-restraint. It is cowardice pure and simple. It is selfishness, let there be no mistake on this point. We must cultivate strength, and when we are strong, we must apply the break to our strength. Keep it within the bounds of law, of decorum, of ordinary humanity, because, remember this, that patriotism is good, excellent, divine, only when it furthers the ends of universal humanity (Certainly). Nationality divorced from humanity is a source of weakness and evil and not of strength and good. Europe has committed a mistake. It has been committing this mistake for many hundreds of years past. Europeans talk of humanity, but their humanity is not humanity, but white-manity (Laughter and cheers); and what is needed for you and me is not to respect white-manity but to respect humanity, not to ask for brown-manity but to ask for humanity, which includes within itself white, brown, black and yellow, all the races of the world. In our campaign of passive resistance, we shall therefore keep always these two things in view, just as I said, respect for the law, provided the law respect the primary rights of the individual and regard for the claims

12

not of any particular section of the human race, nay not even our own section, but regard for the claims of the whole human race, irrespective of the creed and colour and climate. This movement of passive resistance includes, as it is, the most prominent and the correct feature or instrument, the boycott movement (hear, hear). The boycott movement I hold is an organic part of the real Swadeshi movement. We were asked by the Viceroy to cultivate honest Swadeshism, and Lord Minto understood by honest Swadeshim non-political swadeshism. He understood by it the movement for the promotion of the arts and industries of the nation, consistently with the open door in trade and commerce. Honest Swadeshism is Swadeshism within the limits of the free trade policy. That is one thing, and honest Swadeshism is Swadeshism without any political reference or motive behind it. We should have been glad, sir, to follow the advice of such an augnst personage if he could altogether separate not only in India, but in any part of the world, the economic sphere of the people from their politics. Honest Swadeshism is said to be economic Swadeshism, but every tiro in political economy knows that there can be no economics divorced from politics, economics and politics are organically related to one another, and India cannot consider the two apart, separated from and unconnected with one another. Economic Swadeshism may be possible in a free country. Not only in a free country, it may be possible in a country that has fully developed its manufacturing industries. It may be possible in a country which governs itself and has made considerable progress in the manufacture of commodities. Economic Swadeshism may be possible, for instance, in self-governing England which has developed manufacturing industries to so large an extent. But the nation that comes low in the field of world competition, a nation that has at its command almost endless natural re-

sources, a nation that is capable of producing almost infinite quantities of raw materials, but that has not the means and appliances of working out finished commoditiesfrom all these raw materials, for such a nation, specially when it is under the domination of another nation,—a commercial nation, a manufacturing nation which controls and regulates the fiscal policy of the people in the interest not unfrequently of the rulers, the manufacuring country (cries of shame),— for such a nation economic Swadeshism is an utter impossibility. England has something to do with the decay of indigenous industry in India, anp that something, was it merely, Sir, an economic something or a political economic something. Did she not impose restrictions upon our own industries in the earlier days of the East India Company's rule with a view to help and further her own industries (cries of yes)? And when our industries, though in those days could to a very large extent fairly compete with English industries in certain matters, were strangled by the application of political power (pity), is it fair, I ask (most unfair), to ask us now, to cultivate honest Swadeshism, non-political Swadeshism, mere economic Swadeshism (cries of no, no). Why, even now, are they cultivating the honest fiscal policy absolutely free from economic reference? If they had done it there should be some justification forasking us to divorce politics from economics. But what is this 5 per cent. excise duty on the coarse yarn that have been imposed on the product of the Bombay mills. Is that honest economics? The Government of India must at least do this, must repeal this 5 per cent. excise duty before it can consistently with decency ask us to divorce our economics from our politics. There are, I believe, even in our midst our own men who advise us to separate economics from politics (cries of no, no, laughter). I must tell you one thing. If you allow any foreign matter to enter into your

hand even if that matter be such an excellent matter as boycott, it will do no good. Keep boycott in its own place. But there are our own people who advise us to divorce economics from politics, and they say that it is necessary to separate swadeshism from politics, because if we do so, we shall be able to secure the support to this Swedeshi movement of large numbers of people who are in the Government service or who otherwise are afraid of doinganything, which the Government do notcountenance; and with a view to secure the support by these means, practically of the whole nation on behalf of the Swadeshi movement they ask us to keep politics and swadeshism apart from one another. The argument seems to my mind to fail to recognise the psychology of the situation. No Government servant needs be afraid of using country products in preference to foreign imports (hear, hear). No Government servant is prevented or can be precluded from buying shares in Industrial Companies except under certain circumstances, from setting up shops and stores in different places. So far as non-political swadeshism is concerned, it can only promote the production of indigenous articles by organising Joint Stock Companies, by opening shops and stores, and by encouraging the use of indigenous products in preference to foreign imports. And this is all that was done under existing condition. This is the utmost that Government Servants can possibly do to further the cause of economic swadeshism (hear, hear). But what about the general population in the country. Economic Swadeshism before Swaraj aims at a stimulating production; increasing the quantity of native products, improving the quality of our industries and by larger production and better quality, honest Swadeshism helps gradually to push foreign imports out of the Indian market. That is the portion of honest swedeshism. I put it to you, Sir, is this a practical plan of Industrial development in

India under her peculiar position? (No, no). Can you promote the production of manufacturing articles, manufacturing commodities, in the face of the killing competition with foreign imports. It is all well to say, lay out your money, bring out hidden treasures, (how many hundreds of crores it was, according to Lord Curzon, I just now forget). There is a good deal of hidden capital, unused capital lying idle in India, and Lord Curzon advised us to bring it out and to start machines to open factories, and by means of these factories, by a natural process through fair competition drive the foreign imports out of our makets. This is the recipe of those who claim to be eminently practical politicians. Well, the hidden capital of India, if there be such a thing, will it come out at the bidding of the National Congress or of any body else, any more than the people will give up Government service at our bidding? They declared our boycott propaganda to be impracticable, because I believe they will not give up Government service at our bidding. I consider, Sir, that their programme is a practical programme, the programme of honest non-political purely economic swadeshi. But I ask it in all seriousness, will the hidden Capital of India come out of its cover at the bidding of my moderate friends, while at their bidding has not risen in the country a spirit of Commercial co-operation. Can you start factories of the type of the dimensions and capacity of those the products of which are driving the products of your own hand-loom? Can you open factories like those of Manchester, Newcastle or Birmingham, all centres of manufacturing Industry, and if you can, would it be proper, would it be beneficial, would it be conducive to the highest good of the nation to set up an imitation of England, Germany, and America, huge-factories for the production of commodities? Those who have been to England and America, those who know something of

the economic problems of the European countries, those who know something of the results of these large factories, they know it that in Europe and America, humanity is being ruthlessly sacrificed at every centre of manufacturing industry, for the production of commodity (hear, hear). Are you to follow the same ruinous course and sacrifice Indian humanity for the production of commodity? Japan has taken many things from Europe but one thing Japan has refused to take from Europe; that is the European Factory system (hear, hear). The strength of the nation lies in the moral stamina of the people. But factories will kill that moral stamina. Huge factories concentrate population at particular centres, bring people away from their homes, detach them from their friends and family. Starting of big factories may or may not be able to solve the economic problem, but even if they do, it will be at irreparable risk to the moral, spiritual life of the nation and if your moral stamina is destroyed, if the spiritual ideals, the manhood of the nation, if these are killed, what will remain for you to fight the battle of life. Our industrial ideal should not be the ideal of England or America, our industrial methods should not be the method that has been followed, and not followed with complete success, either by England or America, because in every Western country this industrialism has created complex problems of capital and labour, economic and moral before which the wisest statesmen, the greatest thinkers of the nation are sitting down almost in despair; and will you create the same problems in this country also? As in every other matter so in this matter of our industrial development, we will have to follow the lead of her own genius, follow the course indicated by her own past historic fallacy, draw inspiration and strength for guidance from her own past experience and above all keep before our mind's, eye, constantly this great

fact, viz, that as man liveth not by bread alone, so nations also do not live and prosper merely by the production of marketable commodity. What then is the problem of economic swadeshism? Your market is being flooded by foreign imports and the cheapness of these foreign imports has already killed to a large extent (and the operation will be finished within a few years), is killing and will finally kill the indigenous arts and industries of the country. How to save yourself from this killing condition is the problem even of economic swadeshism. If you had a state of your own, if you were a self-governing people, if the government so worked entirely and absolutely in the interests of the people, then this government would have imposed protective tariff upon such foreign imports as threatened to kill native industries. This is done in every part of the world. America has protected and by protecting has developed her arts and industries. Germany has been thriving under a protective tariff. Australia and Canada though parts of the British Empire, element of the British race, they too have not accepted the doctrine of free trade from the mother country as the guiding principle in her economic advancement. But she, by means of a protective tariff prevents the introduction of cheap foreign imports within her territories. India alone cannot do it, because India is not governed by herself, nor governed in her interest and in her interst alone. What then can we do? We can do one thing, we can organize a consumer's league. It is this. In economics there is production and there is consumption. The production is useless without consumption, it is consumption that regulates production and consumption and production are organically related one to the other. Production with a view to control foreign markets is absolutely impossible in India; but we can by regulating the consumption

have some sort of protection to our indigenous arts and industries and the regulation of consumption is the economic principle that underlies the boycott movement. I am bold enough to say and doubly declare this boycott to be a great economic theory. Boycott is protection, it is the imposition of protective tariffs (Hear, hear) upon the people themselves not upon the foreign imports—indirectly upon the foreign imports also—and if protection be declared as of economic value, you are welcome to declare boycott also to be of economic value. But no economist, no economist outside Manchester has ever declared protection to be a wrong.

There are consumer's leagues in Western countries. I happened to be present when I was in New York at a meeting of a Consumer's league there 7 years back. The object of that league was to use the word boycott which meant the boycotting of the produce of certain firms who sweated their labourers. In America there are certain capitalists and combination of capitalists who do not treat their labourers properly, fairly and well. They sweat their labourers, they make them reduce to the position almost of slaves: and the moral sense of the community rising up in arms against this sweating labourers by the producers of commodities, organized itself into a Consumer's league. Those who joined this league took a pledge that they would not under any circumstances buy or use articles produced by such and such a firm who sweated their labourers. There is the boycott, the boycott of those who did not deal fairly with their operatives and I have not as yet heard that a Consumer's league is either an economic folly or a great moral evil. There the Consumer's leagues are organised in the interests of the oppressed labouring population. Here our boycott, our Con-

sumer's league has been organised in the interests of the economic protection, economic advancement and the salvation of the whole nation. We cannot compel the Government to prevent the import of cheap articles into our market that kill by an unfair competition our own industries. But we can do one thing in the country. By our own determination, we can refuse to buy foreign articles, and by refusing to buy foreign articles, we can indirectly protect our own interests by this boycott movement. It is an uphill work. If we had a State, a single law passed by the Legislature would have compelled you and me to buy country-made things, because foreign things could not be had cheaper. But though protection is economically an excellent weapon for saving weak industries from ruinous competition from foreign industries, boycott has got this advantage Boycott not only helps to protect native industries, but it helps to develop the manhood of the nation, the spirit of self-sacrifice in the people; it strengthens the will of the people and enables them to sacrifice immediate good in view of the ultimate good. Therefore though boycott is absolutely justified on economic grounds, it has a greater claim upon our attention, and our allegiance on account of the moral issues involved in it. You ask us to give preference to indigenous arts, indigenous commodities. Do not buy foreign articles, buy your country made articles when you can get them. When you cannot get it, go in for foreign things also. I want a piece of mull, things Swadeshi. I must have it by all means from one of your mills or one of your native stores. But if you cannot have it, buy the foreign thing from any shop that you like. This is striking at the very root of the whole movement, because in these movements that depend for their success upon the determination of the people there is such a thing as *Nishta*, faithfulness, devotion, which must be cultivated and without which the determination

of the people cannot stand. I pledge myself, (no) non-boycott gentlemen pledge themselves. I desire to be abstemious, not to drink intoxicating drinks. That is an excellent desire, is it not? And every one of you will ask me to cultivate it. Do not drink anything but pure water or soda—Brahmin soda. Drink any thing, do not drink wine. But you ask me, if a friend offers and if he is offended do not mind taking a sip; if you are present at a table with a European, and if you feel hurt, do not mind taking a glass of sherry. If you say this it may be a good thing, because you will say, why, you have not the strength of will to put a stop to drinking when you are not in the table of a European. You are a weak man, and you ought to be wise and in the presence of temptation you ought to rise above temptation. Therefore why do you din yourself, why do you put such unreasonable restrictions upon yourself, that you will never drink a drop of wine. Now what will be the actual result? Has Temperance propoganda proceeded along these lines in any part of the world? Has *teetotalism* furnished in any part of the world reform on such humanitarian and tolerant lines. (No, no). Touch not even a small dose of that which intoxicates the brain, that has been the injunction everywhere of temperance reform, and why simply because all these temperance reforms can only proceed upon the determination of the people to avoid the strong drinks and this determination can be kept up by a rigid law of exclusion and if once you allow a man to drink and yet call himself up a total abstainer, you open the floodgate of temptation, and you destory the motive power, the strength of determination, by which you hope to carry out your programme of reform. Therefore in Boycott also, the psychological law must be applied; boycott must be absolute, not of all goods, that is impossible; but within certain limits it must be; absolute because with an absolute boycott, you

cannot keep up the strong determination of the people, you cannot keep up the *Nishta* of the race. That is what is essential; we have not boycotted everything foreign, we do not propose to do so either. They, who say, so misunderstand and misinterpret us. But if we had a state of our own we would have imposed protective tariff against such imports only as threatened to kill our indigenous industries; not upon all, nay, not even the picketted proposes to live isolated from the rest of the world. We have our natural resources to develop. We propose, God willing, to be not only an agricultural, but a manufacturing nation still, and we want to enter upon fair terms into competition with the other races in the markets of the world, and because we desire to do so, we must keep also our door open for the introduction of foreign made articles, because exports and imports are organically related one to the other. If you want to send your men to foreign countries you must leave the door open for foreign produce to enter your own country and your own market. If we had a State organisation of our own, what we would have done is this, we would have taken a survey of our industries, we would have considered what industries have a chance of gaining entrance into the markets of the world, what industries in India had a large future before them, what raw materials we have available, raw materials within the reach of the labouring population within reach of being carried to the world of our own markets, to our own ports, by this means we would have to determine what thing is that we can produce or what are those things that we can produce best and cheapest, and we would have to concentrate our attention upon those things and exclude only those things from our markets that showed a tendency to destroy the chances of the protection of these native industries, not of others that would be the right thing. No Government imposes all-round tariff unless it be for purely fiscal reasons, sometimes

under exceptional circumstances, every country may have to be taxed, but taxation there is not for the purpose of protection but for purely fiscal reasons, because Government want money to carry on the administration, to pay for the debts of the war and for such other reasons and therefore it must tax on all articles indiscriminately. They may possibly be taxed with a view to replenish its lean exchequer. That is a reason, but tariff is not imposed by any nation upon every kind of foreign imports. It is imposed only on those articles that are likely to enter into a dangerous and ruinous competition with the indigenous articles produced in the country. That being so, if we had a state of our own we would have discriminated, we would have taken into consideration our industrial capabilities and we would have guided our protective tariff in the light of the capabilities of our native industries. But, we have not a government and therefore in our boycott we cannot altogether adopt that scientific method, here the method must be a little rough and ready, and what we have done is this. We have taken up three or four articles just for the present that appear to be affected by these foreign imports. We have taken the textile fabric. We produce cotton in this country, and this cotton goes out to England and comes back as yarn or textile fabrics: now, our first boycott is the boycott of foreign clothing, and here the boycott is absolute, there is no exception. We have boycotted foreign salt. Here also the boycott is absolute. We have boycotted foreign sugar. Here also the boycott is absolute. We have boycotted enamelled articles that are killing, if they have not already killed, our brass and bell-metal industries. These are the four things that we have boycotted, foreign cloth, foreign salt, foreign sugar and foreign enamelled articles, and in regard to these four-things the boycott is absolute. In regard to others the boycott is not of

an absolute character. The general truth in fact is, so far as it is practicable, support home industries and give preference to home products even if they are dearer than foreign imports. That is the general principle of boycott, but in its application we have laid special stress upon 3 or 4 things, as I have indicated them already, *viz*, upon cloth, salt, sugar and enamelled wares, and partly also upon glass wares and generally upon all articles of luxury. This is the extent of our boycott. We never proposed to boycott every article. We do not propose to boycott English books, we do not propose to boycott scientific instruments. We do not propose to boycott machinery. We do not propose to boycott arms and ammunition (laughter.) We shall want them. We shall get them. We shall strengthen our material life with the help of all these. Wherefrom shall we get them. Let it not be said if we are boycotters—why use Railways or tramcars, or why read English books or use electric fans and electric light. No, Sir, we cannot go back to barbarism. That will not be helpful to rational growth but we shall buy foreign goods always with an eye to this that by using foreign goods we do not injure the possibilities of the production of those goods in our own country. That is what must be done, and in regard to three or four things the boycott must be absolute. Under no circumstances shall we use any forign textile fabric. Under no circumstances shall we take a pinch of foreign sugar or a pinch of salt; but we shall buy instruments and other things wherever we can get them. As regards books, in the domain of knowledge there is no trade such as we have in the domain of commodities. All knowl edge is divine; the sciences, the philosophies, the arts of Europe are not European. They are all God divine and every man who has a mind partakes in the general mental and intellectual life of the whole of the human race because all minds are one

and that mind is the mind of God. Every one who has the sense of the beautiful in him has a right, a native right upon every article of arts, upon everything that is beautiful because it is of God divine and all beauty is one. In the domain of learning, there is no distinction of race, and colour and clime. Knowledge is one. Sicence is one. Art in the higher domains is one. And every child of God has a natural right to all those things wherever they may be formed or grown. No, we do not mean to avoid these things. This, then, gentlemen, is our boycott movement. But the question arises about the political aspect of boycott. Industrially, this is what boycott means. But it is also a political weapon, a political weapon in this sense. It is a weapon of passive resistance. It is a weapon that is capable of retaliating the iniquity that is inflicted upon us by the domination of another people. If the English were merely our political rulers as the Moghuls were, as the Pathans were before the Moghuls, the case would have been different. But unfortunately the British Government in India from the days of the Company has been like the mythical mermaids—half trader and half ruler. That ruler we may obey, but when the ruler enters the arena of trade he must submit to ordinary law of pushing and elbowing that is common to the commercial life. And yet one misfortune is that the present Government in this country uses its authority as a Government for the protection of its interests as a trader. Let it not be said that I am misconstruing and misinterpreting the benign purpose of the Government. I have my authority for this statement, and that authority is no less than the late Viceroy of India. Lord Curzon himself, speaking to certain miners, declared, 'Your work lies in exploitation. My work lies in administration and exploitation and administration are parts of the same duty in the Government of India.' What does it mean? It means

that the authority of the administration is to be applied for helping exploitation and the resources that exploitation placed in the hands of the exploiter, the Chambers of Commerce, are to be utilised for the purposes of administration. The Government House extends its hands across the streets to the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Commerce takes it by one hand and stretches the other hand to the Government House, and between the two they manage to exploit for administration and administer for exploitation; and yet in the face of such a significant declaration from one than whom no greater authority ever existed in this country for making such a declaration, yet even in the face of such a distinct declaration from the head of the Government of India, we are asked, Sir, to divorce politics from economics and economics from politics. What has happened in Eastern Bengal? We declared a boycott of British goods. That was, as I have said, economically the organisation of Consumer's league. We are asked not to buy British goods. Is it not within the rights of every citizen to induce his fellow citizen to do or not to do something which in itself is not illegal. Is not to buy foreign goods illegal? Is not to use Manchester cloth illegal? Is it illegal not to use foreign salt or not to taste foreign sugar? Is it illegal for a man to persuade his neighbour not to use it (No, no). What do we do? Any thing more than what the temperance preacher does? That is picketting. Why? Not only in temperance; you do picketting work in our temple fairs. It is not illegal for the Christian *Padre* to stand in the front of a temple in fairs and call names and try to lower the religious ideals of the country in the estimation of the people. That is picketting, I dare say. The *Padre* says 'don't go and worship these gods.' Is it not picketting? The temperance preacher stands not far from the door of the grog shop, and he commences to

preach against the use of liquors. He asks people not to drink. Is that not picketting? Does it not inflict injury on the poor man who sells liquor? and yet who ever heard that this picketting is condemned as criminal. But people were barrassed and prosecuted, handed down by the Police, held up before the Magistrate and sent to jail simply because they asked their fellow men, there countrymen, their neighbours, their friends, their co-villagers to desist from supporting foreign industries and articles. But it is due to this fact—administration and exploitation are parts of the same duty in the Government of India.

There is a very large and important mart on the banks of the river Magna which is really the Ganges in Eastern Bengal and a little over a year ago one flat loaded with Liverpool salt was sent to that mart. The coolies of that mart refused to unload the flat. The flat was sent by Turner Morrison & Co., Calcutta, and what happened? Possibly Turner Morrison & Co., when they heard that no cooly in Bhara Bazaar would touch their salt must have informed the authority of it. That is my infereuce. I do not know the fact but the fact was that in the course of three or four days the Sub-Divisional Magistrate of Kasargung within whose jurisdiction Bhara Bazaar is located came to that Bazaar and called for the chief officer of the zemindar who owns that Bazaar and asked him what it was. "What is it, Sir, that these coolies refused to touch foreign salt and will not unload the flat." He said, "What can I do." That Magistrate said, "You must be responsible for it, you must be working for it." He said, 'You call the coolies.' The coolies were brought The Magistrate asked, "Why do you refuse to carry foreign salt from the flat to the godown." They said, "We are not to do so" "Ordered

by whom," asked the Magistrate. "By our Biradhari, by our caste priest and if we touch it our *hookha* will be stopped, we shall be put out of caste." The Magistrate was non-plussed. He could not catch the Manager and Turner Morrison & Co, had to send a consignment of coolies from Calcutta to unload the salt at Bhara Bazaar. But the significant fact in this connection is the anxiety of the Sub-Divisional Magistrate to help the unloading of the foreign salt at Bhara Bazaar. Why? Was it a part of his duty to see that Turner Marrison & Co. did not suffer demurrage? Was he paid for it? (cries of no, no.) This same Sub-Divisional Magistrate had no time to go and make a local inquiry into a most pitiable case. It was the case of a young girl of 14 who had been one night when she went out of her hut decoyed by a number of Mahomedan *gundas*. After a week she was found in a wretched condition in a jungle, thrown away by them. She was brought. The case was instituted. It was a case of rape, inhuman outrage on that Hindu girl and the Sub-Divisional Magistrate had no time to go and make a local inquiry (cry of shame). Does it not prove exploitation and administration are parts of the same duty in the Government of India? Let those of our friends who ask us to separate politics from boycott, politics from Swadesism, let them work out the separation of administration from exploitation in the policy of the Government of India (hear, hear). Let the Government of India refuse to utilise the powers of administration for purpose of exploitation, and then we may justly be asked by the officials and by our Moderate friends to work out a divorce between politics and pure Swadesism. The fact is, my dear friends that this Swadesism or boycott is not a mere economic movement. No economic movement is purely economic. Politics and economics are indissolubly bound up together in every

country, so it is in India. There are special reasons which I have already placed before you why it is impossible to work out a divorce between politics and economics, politics and industries in India. Swadesism must associate itself with politics and when Swadesism associates itself with politics, it becomes boycott, and this boycott is a movement of passive resistance. It is a movement of the determination of the people not only to save the industries of the nation but also to create those forces in the community which by passive methods work out the problem of *Swaraj*. Boycott in Bengal is not boycott of foreign goods. In it is included other than textile fabrics, sugar, salt. We have boycotted honorary offices to some extent. In East Bengal not a single popular man offered to stand for election to the New Legislative Council and the time is coming when they will boycott Municipalities and District Boards also. The meaning of this boycott is this. It desires to reduce the Government to Shylock's pound of flesh rule. You have political authority over us. We recognise that authority. You are entitled to all taxes. We shall pay them but nothing more than the taxes. We shall pay municipal rates but there our work is done. You shall have to look to the sweeping and the cleaning of the streets. We shall pay the taxes but nothing more than the payment of the taxes. You shall have to carry on the administration yourself. A local Anglo-Indian paper finds a strange contradiction in my speech the other night when I said that we are people governing the country, and yet we have no share in the Government of the country; and he could not understand the subtlety of the oriental intellect. He could not understand that both the things might be true. We might govern and yet we might not govern (laughter). I wonder if he understands the mystery of the Trinity. There re three Gods and yet the three are one. The Chinese could

not understand this arithmetic that one and one and one make three, they say. Yet what Indian ever said that this doctrine of Trinity was a foolish doctrine? There is transcendental truth in this doctrine of Trinity; we have our own Vedántic conception of the Trinity. We understand these things, but the *Mail* could not understand. How is it that we govern and yet we do not govern? The *how* is easily explained. We govern the country and yet we do not know that we govern the country. *Maya*, *Maya* means this, want of knowledge; the removal of *Maya* creates no new factor. It simply gives a new meaning to the old factor, and it is the want of this meaning in the factor that we govern the country that makes the difference between *Swara*j and *Parara*j and in this boycott and by this boycott we propose to create in the people consciousness of the Pararaj on the one hand and the desire for Swaraj on the other. It is by the assertion of the determination of the people against the despotism of the Government within absolutely legal bounds that we can hope to kill the *Maya* that has overcome us and that is the end of the boycott politically. We shall reduce the Government to the pound by the flesh rule. They say, 'Can you boycott all Government offices.' Who ever said that we would? Whoever said that there would be found not a single Indian to serve the Government or the European community here? But what we can do is this. We can make the Government impossible, without entirely making it impossible, for them to find people to serve them. We did it in East Bengal. Lord Minto admits it. In his letter to Sir Bampfylde Fuller in reply to his resignation letter, what does he say? He said that an organised attempt was being made in East Bengal to make the administration impossible and you havedone well to resign. Lord Minto recognised the possibility of the people by an organised attempt to make the administration

impossible. The administration may be made impossible in a variety of ways. It is not actually that every Deputy Magistrate should say I won't serve in it. It is not that when one man resigns no body will be found to take up his place. Not that. But if you create this spirit in the country the Government service will gradually imbibe this spirit and they will occasionally strike work, and a whole office might go into strike. That does not put an end to the administration, but it creates endless complications in the work of the administration and if these complications are created in every part of the country, the administration would have been brought to a dead-lock and it has still made it none the less impossible and the primary thing is prestige of the government, and the boycott strikes at the root of that prestige. This determination of the people to assert themselves within absolutely legal bounds against the despotic authority of the Government takes away naught from that authority, but that Magic, that illusory thing which they call prestige which is more powerful, more potent than the authority itself and we propose to do this, by means of boycott. Boycott is not a great folly. There are people to whom the words of the Englishmen are as good as gospel truth and for their benefit it may be said that Professor Seeley, the author of the Expansion of England, himself confessed it that, if at any time the Indian people became practically of one mind not to help our administration we would have to quit the country at once (cheers). This is what Professor Seeley said and boycott means an attempt to unite the determination of the people of India with a view to the application of that determination upon the Government of the country to cure their despotic character, and in this we are not moved by any hatred. We do not hate, Sir, the foreigner, we do not hate the British, nay not even the Government. We want to be indiffer-

out to them That is all (laughter and cheers), benevolently indifferent to them, and if there is such a thing as benevolent despotism I think there may be such a thing as benevolent indifference. We desire to turn our faces away from the Government House, turn it to the huts of the people. We desire to stop our mouth so far as the appeal to Government is concerned and to open our mouth with a new appeal, a new petition or application to our own countrymen, to our own people, to the masses of our own people. This is the psychology, this is the ethics and this is the spiritual significance of the boycott movement A boycott of all Government offices will not be complete. No body says it will be complete. But we can do one thing. The Government Service has extraneous value attached to it, a value which is more than the actual money that a Government servant receives from the Government. There are cases of men with an income of Rs. 1,00. a year giving security to the extent of Rs 10,000 with a view to secure the post of a Treasurer on Rs. 80 a month. This man himself can keep two treasurers for his own *cutcheri* and yet he wants to become a tresurer in a Collectorate, simply for the sake of its prestige, the social position that goes with the Government service. We can kill that at any rate. We can induce Government service to its money value (laughter) if we can't reduce it lower, not that no man shall serve the Government, but whoever serves Government social opinion may one day bring him down to the position of a *Vratya* who is not a Brahman but was having failed to pass through the ceremony of *Upanayanam*, falls short of Brahmanhood. We can reduce every Indian in Government service to the position of a man who has fallen off from the dignity of Indian citizenship. We can do something more by the application of our social opinion, drive those to Government service who do not find any other opening for earning a livelihood,

reduce them to what is known in our smrithi as *apadharma*. Certain things are probited, but in times of famine when the alternative is to eat the prohibited food or death, the *Shastra* permits the use of prohibited food. That is *apadharma* and when the alternative before the man is death or Government service we shall allow him the latter. We can reduce in this way the value of the Government service in this country and if we do it, it will be as good as boycott, because people who will go there are those driven by extreme necessity. Social opinion will not encourage any man to go and seek Government service. No man shall receive social honors, because he is a hakim or a munsiff or a huzur sheristadar. These we can do and if we do it as I said, it will be practically as good as boycott. There was a time, and even now it is so in some parts of the country, a man would not sell shoes or leather goods if he was a Brahman. There was a time, and still it obtains in some parts, when no Brahman or Kshatriya would earn by selling shoes. Yet it is conceivable that a man might be reduced to the extreme necessity of opening a shop for the sale of leather goods and he will earn his livelihood thereby, but he will fall in the estimation of his country and countrymen. Similarly we may reduce the Government service to something that is not very desirable, and by these means we may make the administration impossible, because if we are able to create such a public opinion in our society, then the temptations of continuing in the Government service, even when the conditions of the service require men to sacrifice their conscience or self-respect, will have no effect. Now, a man cannot give his service. only for the money, the honor of the position, the estimation in which he is held by his people and he pockets his conscience with all the insults he receives from his superiors,

because he knows there is ample compensation in the *Salam* that he receives from the people. The Deputy Magistrate pockets his conscience and pocket all the insults that he receives from the official, because these things are known to nobody else; but when he goes out of office he receives *salams* and he is called *Ayah* by every one. Therefore he pockets this when he comes to know that nobody else will know it. But when he goes out of the office nobody *salams* him then the temptation for sacrificing his conscience, then the self-respect for keeping his office will be reduced to a minimum; and the fact of it will be endless difficulties in maintaining the discipline of the Government offices. This is what it will come to and this is absolutely lawful, because there is no law that compels him to prostrate himself before the feet of the *Hakim*. No law can compel him to give a chair to a man who comes to his house, he may give it to an ordinary shop keeper, he may refuse that honor to the Deputy Magistrate or a Subordinate Judge. He may give his daughter in marriage to a poor beggar he may refuse any marriage alliance with the son of a Deputy Magistrate, because it is absolutely within his rights, absolutely within legal bounds. Keeping ourselves within the bounds of law we may well hope to make the administration somewhat difficult if not impossible and that is passive resistance. Passive resistance is recognised as legitimate in England. It is legitimate in theory even in India and if it is made illegal by new legislation these laws will infringe on the primary rights of personal freedom and will tread on dangerous grounds. Therefore, it seems to me, Sir, that by means of this boycott, we shall be able to negative the work that will have to be done for the attainmet of Swaraj. That is negative work. Positive work will have to be done and it may create a determination in the people to attain *Swaraj*. It may create the strength of

the people to sacrifice their interest, immediate interest for the good of the country. Boycott may do all these things, but without positive training no self-Government will come to the boycotter. It will have through the organization of our village life, organization of our talukas and districts. Let our programme include the setting up of a machinery, for popular administration and running parallel to, but independent of the existing administration of the Government (Hear, hear). It is not illegal for the people of any village to combine their labour or their money and to dig a tank for their own use or sink a well for their own use or to construct a road that will take them from their village to the ordinary District Beard roads. 'Is it unlawful? No. Is it unlawful to combine for these purposes, to combine for purposes of medical relief, to combine for purposes of educational advancement, of industrial advancement, to tax themselves subject to a central organisation with a view to work out within local limits, to remove their own wants? I daresay no one will say it is unlawful, and yet we propose to start a practical scheme of self-Government running parallel to the District Boards and Municipalities and even the Provincial Government. (Cheers). We are doing it, we have done it partly in some districts in Bengal. We are organizing our Arbitration Committees in our villages. Is it unlawful, Sir, for the people to refuse to go to Courts and be heavily taxed for seeking justice at their hands and for their civil complaints being heard by men of their own choosing who will adjudicate their claims. Is it unlawful? No. We are organizing these arbitration committees and when our organization is complete the Law Courts will be relieved considerably of their present pressure. Our medical men appointed by us, by the funds collected on the principle of taxation by the people themselves,

will distribute medical relief. Our minor Public works will be executed by the Co-operative labour of the villagers, because we cannot always command the co-operation in money. But it is easier to combine to work out Co-operative labour in Indian villages and by means of this Co-operative labour we hope to run our own Public Works Department parallel to the Public Works Department of the District Boards and Municipalities and we propose also our own police, our own volunteers who will not usurp the functions of the Police in the matter of criminal investigation, but who will help the protection of person and property of the people. Can you prevent half a dozen young men properly trained, properly guided, who keep themselves absolutely within the law, but who go about every night in the streets of a village keeping watch and ward over the property of the villagers and prevent burglaries and other things which are often times done with the connivance of the Police? These are things which we propose to do and once we are able to organize the country in this way, then I think, we shall prove conclusively, we shall offer a practical demonstration to our opponents and to our friendly critics who always crow on the want of capacity in the people for self-Government. We shall offer conclusive proof to all these people for the capacity of the Indian population to organize their forces with a view to administer their forces themselves faithfully in few things. In the providence of God we shall then be made the rulers over many things. This is our programme. This, Sir, is the method by which we hope gradually to strengthen the manhood of the nation, to create in the community the determination to work out their own salvation themselves and to give them the training in the art of civic life, co-operative work for public good, in the art of self-government. We hope to do it by these means and we purpose

to supplement, strengthen, the boycott by means of a system of national education which will undertake to train up the people, the youth of the nation in such a way as will enable them to earn an independent living, independent of the Government service or those professions which are under the control of the foreign Government. The subject of national education itself will demand a separate and exhaustive treatment. So I propese to take that question up some day next week (Loud cheers).

Contribution of Islam to Indian Nationality.

(FIFTH LECTURE.)

Mr. Chairman and Fellow-Countrymen,—I am sincerely thankful to the Young Men's Mahomedan Association (hear, hear) for this opportunity that they have given me of speaking upon a subject which concerns most vitally the future well-being of this great country. (Hear, hear). We hear often-times of the Hindu-Mahomedan problem. I will not to-night enter upon a consideration of the nature of this problem. I will not try to trace its history either. This much I may be permitted to say that in the days of my youth, not to go farther, before we had no Hindu-Mahomedan problem in any part of India, our religions were different, our social customs did not agree; we could not eat and drink with one another; but both the Hindus and the Mahomedans fully respected the conscientious scruples of the two communities (hear, hear) and differences due to religious considerations or social customs did not create any ill-feeling between Hindu and Mahomedan neighbours. Speaking of Bengal, I may say that, so far as my memory goes, and I am going close upon half a century of earthly life, we never had in our villages or in our towns until very recently any unpleasantness between the two communities. (Hear hear). In my own village we had a Mahomedan neighbour, a Mahomedan Zemindar. We had many Mahomedan friends, but I was referring to a Mahomedan Zemindar who was our neighbour; and in our village relations I remember that I used to call him my *chasha* or uncle as his son used to call may father as his *chasha* or uncle (Hear, bear, and cheers.) On the occasion of any marriage in my family we used to invite this Mahomedan Zemindar

family and they used to make presents to the bride and bridegroom on those occasions (hear, hear). In village life in Bengal in the olden times there was a great deal of exchange of social amenities which is falling into disuse and decay owing to the ingress of modern civilization. On marriage and other festive occasions we rarely bought fish in Bengal—we do take fish—we rarely bought fish from the bazaar. We had our own tanks whence we could draw our own fish and on those festive occasions in my house the Mahomedan Zemindar would place his fish pond at our disposal and we would do the same when there was any festival in his house. During the Mahomedan festivals, on the occasion of *yedda* and other festivals we used to send presents to this Mahomedan Zemindar and, strange to say, on the occasion of Durga Puja in my father's house we invited them. It is not they would send us any present but they would accept our invitation and come and exchange social amenities apart from the religious worship. In my part of the country it was a custom in the days of my youth when there was any death in a family and there was a *Sradha* ceremony to be performed, friends and relations from distant parts of the country used to send special contributions. These contributions were regulated by the relative position and respectability of the people making them and receiving them. With regard to some the regulated fee, so to say, was Rs. 4. That is in the case of a *Sradha* in a family, they would send Rs. 4 and a piece of cloth and in the case of *Sradha* in their families my parents would send Rs. 4 and a piece of cloth in return. In others the regulated fee was Rs. 2, with some Re. 1, with some half a rupee; and this relation existed between my family and this neighbouring Zemindar family. When there was any mourning in their family we used to send them this money and this present and when there was any *Sradha* in our family, they used to do the

same. This, Sir, was the relation that existed even in East Bengal 25 and 30 years ago, 15 years ago, 10 years ago between the Hindus and Mahomedans of that Province. About this time last year I was in Comilla and I was invited by a dozen respectable Mahomedans of that town to address a public meeting specially organized by them over which a Mahomedan Zemindar of the town presided; and on the day when this meeting was advertised, as I was taking a little rest in the afternoon, I received a surprise visit from the *shian* of that Mahomedan Zemindar family who was my father's neighbour, who had married in Comilla and by marriage was connected with one of the highest Mahomedan families in that district. I had left my village almost when I was in my teens. My connection with my village had practically ceased for quarter of a century and I did not know that this young man belonged to a family, which was one of the families that stood in friendly relations with my family; I did not know that this youngman watched my movements; I did not know that he would care to know me and I was surprised to find him coming to see me at a time that was significant, at a time when some attempts were being made in Comilla itself to influence the aristocracy among the Mahomedan population to keep themselves away from the Hindu movements. This visit was significant; it had no political reference. It was significant as the evidence of the old friendship that existed between my family and this respectable Mahomedan family in my village. (Hear, hear.) This was the state of things quarter of a century ago. This was, as I said, true of many parts of Bengal 10 year ago. This was true almost I was going to say 5 years' back. It is therefore that I say, Sir, that we have not known really any Hindu Mahomedan problem; yet it must be said that since difference have commenced to arise between the two communities due to whatever causes it may be,

it is necessary that those who wish well of the two communities and of the country at large should put their heads together, (Laughter and cheers) and devise some means by which this estrangement may at once be put a stop to; (hear, hear) for let us remember this, that, though the Mahomedans came to India originally from another land and were originally alien conquerors, they have lived in the country among its people for nearly more than thousand years now (hear, hear) and they have become part and parcel of the great Indian nation. (Hear hear). And they followed the example that the Hindus themselves had set, because this country at one time did not belong to the Hindus either. They came from another country, conquered the aboriginal races, established and spread their civilization and culture and became in process of time the inhabitants of this country. So the Mahomedans also coming from another country to conquer those that had come before them, gradually established their rule over them and in course of a few centuries they became organically a part of the nation, which they had originally conquered and come to live among. (Cheers.) The Indian nation is not a Hindu nation. The Indian nation is not a Mahomedan nation either, nor is the Indian nation composed of Hindus and Mahomedans alone. There are others, Christians and they form a large proportion indeed of the Indian Nationality. There are others though smaller in number, but great in wealth and considerably advanced in culture—the Parsees. (Cheers) There are also the followers of Gouthama Budha and these different cultures, all these different communities constitute the new Indian nation. (Laughter and Cheers). When I was talking of *Swaraj*, when I talked of India and Indian Nationality I did not, I beg to assure you, talk either of the Hindu or of the Mahomedan, Budhists or Parsees But I talked of all those, who belong to this land who, where-

ever they may live, have their *life-desire* to spend the evening of that life within these shores, who earn money elsewhere but desire to contribute their earning to the economic advancement of this nation (hear, hear and cheers), who gather the wisdom of the world with a view to replenish the culture of the East—the civilisation of this land. It is this land which to them is dearer tha all lands. (Cheers) It is this land which has borne on its lap their forefathers and this land it is wherein they hope and pray that their children, and their children may grow and develop and be happy and wise, and advance in every department of human culture from generation to generation (Cheers.) The Hindu Mahomedan problem to whatever cause or causes it may be due desires therefore our most serious consideration. And I believe it, Sir, that this problem can be best solved by an understanding on the part of the Hindus of the excellence of Islamic culture and Islamic civilisation and by similar appreciation on the part of my Mahomedan friends of Hindu culture and Hindu civilisation. (Hear, hear).

The problem, if any problem exists at all, exists as I said the other night, not among the lower orders of the two communities. The conflict is among the higher classes wherever there is this conflict, and if the higher classes who alone are able to study, to understand, to appreciate and to honor the universal elements of their respective cultures, if the higher classes will apply themselves, the Hindu to the study of Islamic colture and civilisation, and the educated Mahomedan to the study of Hindu culture and civilisation, I believe it will be impossible for either of them not to respect one another, and where the classes are trained and led to respect one another, then the masses who are already living in amity will grow in community of interest, mutual respect and friendship more

and more. (Hear, hear.) It is for this reason, gentlemen, that I want to draw your attention just for a few moments and very briefly to the contributions that have been made by Islam to to the general progress of Indian life, since Islam became a political factor in this country. (Hear, hear). In the first place you, Gentlemen, who are Hindus are proud of your religious ideals, and there are two ideals that stand out above the rest in the whole religious culture of Hinduism. These two ideals are the ideal of Yoga or concentration and the ideal of Viraigya or renunciation and disattachment. But do you know that, as you had your Yogies and your Viragies, the ideal of Yoga and Viragya flourished as much among the founders, among the teachers, among the saints and sages of Islam, as it flourished, and as it is to be found among your own prophets and teachers, and saints and seers? You know of the great Viraigya of King Janaka who, though king of kings, never felt any attachment to the earthly things. But do you know that the world has not as yet known of an example of absolute dis-attachment, grander, nobler, diviner than that which was set by the founder, the prophet of Islam. (Cheers.) When he died what did he leave? He, the first founder of Islamic Empire, he, who had fought many battles, conquered many peoples and received, according to the custom, his share of the booty in many wars, what did he leave? A torn mat and an earthen chetty. These were all the earthly effects of the first prophet, Emperor of Islam, Mahomed himself. (Cries of Allaho Akbar.) The story is recited of Mahomed and his daughter, and his son-in-low Ali. Ali one day became victorious in a battle and had his part of the booty, he got a large number of gold coins. Mahomed had nothing to eat that day. But, thinking that his son-in-law having received a large booty would be able to feed him and his friends, Mahomed with his

disciples went to Ali's house and he called out to Ali. All was not at home but his wife Hazath, Mahomed's daughter was there. She answered to the call of her father. Mahomed asked his daughter to come out. She said, "Father, are you alone or are there others with you? He said "yes—I have got my friends." I cannot come out. Why? I have no decent garments to appear before anyone except yourself. Then, he said, we have come to have a good dinner at your house. Where is Ali? She said "Ali has not returned." 'But give us then a good dinner.' 'Father, my little baby had not had milk to drink this day.' 'What, your baby had no milk to drink; how came it to be?' And the lady replied:—'What Alli received as his booty, he distributed on the spot to the fakirs.' Is this not an example of Viraigya? You talk of Yoga, of concentration but do you know that there was Samadhi even in the Mahomedan prophets, Saints, and Seers. This incident is related of Ali. Ali was wounded in the battle and the spear that wounded him entered his flesh just underneath his knee and it was so painful that he would not allow any body to touch it. His disciple came to Mahomed and said, "We are in a fix, a broken spear has got into the thigh of Ali, but Ali will not allow us to touch it. How are we to bring it out? Then Mahomed said, "Do not do anything now. When the time of prayer comes, and when Ali sits down to pray, draw it out and he will not feel it." And when the time of prayer came, and Ali sat down to pray, the spear was drawn away by force, out of his flesh, and he did not feel that it was drawn. (Cries of Allaho Akbar.) Talking of Yoga and Samadhi, I am reminded of another anecdote concerning the Hazrath himself and it is this. You know that his beloved wife was Ayesha and it often times happened that if when Mahomed was in the company of Ayesha, talking to her completely forgetful of the

whole world, engaged in mutual conversation, when there was a flow of heart and a feast of soul between husband and wife, at that moment if the Muzzin's call to prayer went out, Mahomed could not recognise Ayesha who was sitting before him. The call to prayer at once took the soul of Mahomed to his God and he became absolutely forgetful of all his earthly surroundings including the presence of his beloved and beautiful wife herself. If you read the *Khoran*, if you read the Aziza, if you read the traditions of Islam, if you read the lives of Mahomedan saints, you will find underneath all this divergence of ritual and ceremonial and dogma and custom, there is the spirit of devotion to God, there is the spirit of concentration and meditation to God; there is the spirit of disattachment as much in Islam, as is found in Hinduism or in any other religion. (Hear, hear.) But it is not merely the general unit between the highest religious ideal of Islam and the highest ideals of piety of the Hindus, upon which our mutual appreciation and understanding must be based. Islam as an Empire as a governing power as a political anthority has made contributions to the general life of India, which is not as yet made perhaps by any political power. We seem to think that the idea of Empire in India is a new idea imported from the West, but long before the British raised up the Standard of Empire in India the Mogals had done it. The process of Indian unification though it has received considerable impetus from the present British administration did not start with the establishment of this administration. The process of Indian uniffication had commenced with the establishment of the general authority of the Mogals all over Indian Continent. The idea of Indian Nationalism though it has been considerably developed by the contribution of European thought and culture did not originate with the establishment of British Rule. It grew with the

growth and expansion of the Mogal Empire (hear, hear.) The growth of an Empire always everywhere helps the growth of national unions and under the proper ideal of Empire, nations grow more rapidly than they are able to grow within isolated Kingdoms and small principalities.

I am, Sir, an imperialist, an imperialist of an imperialist, but it must be an Empire of a right sort. It must be an empire where all the component parts shall enjoy equal liberty and equal freedom. It must be an empire which will be an empire of the people or, if it be an empire of any particular dynasty at least among the people themselves, there shall run a practical equality and practical rights equal rights and equal freedom (hear, hear) and thought here were differences recognised by Mahomedan administration in certain matters between the Hindus, between the non-Mahomedans subjects of the Emperors of Delhi and elsewhere, those differences I make bold to say, were not political differences but they were more or less exclusively religious differences. Undor the Muhamadans, the Pattans and the Moghuls, had the Hindus not a right of using arms? Were the Hindus deprived of that right? Under the Moghuls, the Mahomedans could not claim the privelege of being tried by a special Court while the Hindus had to be tried by another Court. Under the Moghuls the Muhamadan prisonor did not live in storied building while the Hindu prisoner lived in the first floor. There were distinctions but as I said, they were religious distinctions and the idea of equality before law, the fundamental idea in the growth of nationalities was received first of all from our Mahomedan friends. Before the advent of the Mahomedans we, Hindus, had no rights apart from that which was determined by our status. Before the Muhamadans our civil rights and even our criminal rights were

all determind by our caste itself—by the status of the individual. That is decidedly, Sir, a lower stage in the growth of civic life, a lower stage in the evolution of jurisprudence and it is the Muhamadans who gave us a right, a political right in India apart from and independent of, our status as members of particular castes and communities. There lies the foundation of democracy, there lies the foundation of real national life, there lies the foundation of true civic equality and this foundation was laid by the Muhamadans. Our law, the Hindu law received material contributions from the Muhamadan law and administration, our fiscal system grew out of our old Village limitation to a more or less extent into a general fiscal system under the Muhamadans and the fiscal system of the Muhamadans especially so far as the land revenues are concerned, has not been improved if it has at all been improved by the advanced and civilised administration of Great Britain. A great deal is said now and then by ignorant men even among my own people about Jezia, the tax that was imposed by Aurangzeb upon Hindus and from which the Mahomedans were free. But I have a suspicion, Sir. If I am wrong, you will correct me that the *Jezia* is really a war tax. It was a tax levied upon those who did not bolong to Islam but who were subject to the rule of Islam. It was a tax levied upon subjects of Islam who did not follow the rules of Islam, because every member of the Islamic brotherhood, every subject of the Islamic common wealth had to render military service in the wars of Islam, but those who did not belong to the Islamic common wealth could not be compelled to render this military service and in lieu of this military service which every member of Islam had to render to the commonwealth of Islam, those who did not not belong to Islam but who were subject to this common wealth had to pay this special tax of

Jezia. It was not therefore a special tax that was levied upon the Hindus by the Mahomedan rulers of India, but it was a tax levied upon every one who did not render and who could not be called upon to render personal military service for the execution of religious wars of Islam. (Hear, hear). Now, Sir, briefly speaking, in politics, in administration, those have been the contributions of Islam to the general growth of Indian National life; but far more valuable have been the contributions of Islam to the social and religious life of India. All our great reforms in the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries were really the product of the influence of Islam upon Hindu thought. Nanak owed his monotheism and a good deal of his religious ideals to Islamic culture and Islamic tradition. In the scripture of Sheikhs you will find quotation from the Vedas the Upanishads, the Puranas, standing side by side with citations from the life and teachings of the Mahomedan saints and sages, men like ShiekFarid and others. The movement of Mahomedan influenced? Even the movement of Kabir owed something to our contact with Mahomedan thought and culture. I am not aware, Sir, of the Bhaghavatars of Southern India who lived and flourished 400 or 500 years back who were contemporaries of Nanak in Punjab, of Kabir in Upper India, of Chaitanya in Bengal and of Thukaram on the Bombay side. But we know there was a great spiritual upheaval four or five years back in India, the upheaval that tried to raise socially and morally the lowest classes of the Indian community, an up heaval that declared more or less openly a war against the system of caste, an upheaval that sought to raise in virtue the spiritual excellence and character the lowest Pariah to the position of the saint and the seer and this upheaval which on the political side again contributed to the effort at nation-building of Sivaji in the Maharatta country, of Gurugovind, in the

Punjab, of Prataparudra in Bengal. All this political, spiritual, religious, and social upheaval were due to the influence of the ideal and culture of Islam upon Hindu thought, Hindu life, Hindu culture and Hindu ideals (cheers); and keeping all this in view, is it at all surprising that we who have come now under other influences seek to combine our forces and resources and try to work out a larger, a deeper, a wider union between the different Indian communities than had been known in the past. The Indian nation which we desire to build up in this country will differ from other nations in the world. Nations grew in the past by the accretion of small tribes, tribal organizations that were more or less in their fluid state coming together under the stress of political circumstances, formed themselves into larger nations. But, in India the problem of nation building stands on a different plane. In India it is not as it were of old in other countries and even in this country is it not with a few fluid tribal organizations that met together under stress of common political circumstances and are trying to form themselves into a compact nation. No. In India, not fluid tribal organisations but developed cultures fully developed communities with a past history of their own, with a special characteristic of their own, with religions of their own, with traditions of their own, such nations, grown up nations, who have developed cultures have come together in India in the present day and the nation that will have to be built up in India, therefore, will have to be built up by the union of fully developed cultures, fully developed nationalities and not by the union as of old, of fluid tribal organisations and when fully developed, nationalities come together in one territory, and commence to live one common civic and commercial life. The nation that must grow out of that must be a federated nation, and a nation that will respect and recognise the individuality of the different parts of it, the

nation that will present to the world a miniature ideal of a federated humanity, tho dream of the poet, the hope of the man of God.

When the great world cultures meet together they shall contribute that which is best and highest in them for the general uplifting and advancement of humanity, when each culture will receive from other cultures that which it lacks in itself and will contribute to those cultures things that it has developed specially in itself and which they may be lacking in ; that is the problem of nation building in India. The future Indian nation will not be a nation that will profess one religion. The future Indian nation will not be a nation that will accept one social code, the future Indian nation will not be a nation that will submit itself to one particular set of spiritual or ethical discipline. We cannot obliterate the past, neither can the Hindu cease to be a Hindu, nor can the Mahomedan cease to be a Mahomedan ; for the Hindu to cease to be a Hindu is to forego his claims to the service of humanity ; for the Muhamadan to cease to be a Muhamadan is similarly to forego his claims to render his own service to universal humanity. The Hindu must continue to be a Hindu, must grow as a Hindu along his own line, following his own historic evolution towards his own ideal. The Mahomedan must continue to be a Mahomedan, must develop Islamic feeling, traditions of Islamic history and Islamic culture and the Christian shall continue to be Christian following the line of Christian civilisation, Christian culture and Christian tradition. The Parsee similarly shall continue to be a Parsee, grow in his own special life and culture but all these shall contribute their best and their highest to the common life of the nation and shall exchange one with another the best and the highest that they have in them. (Cheers).

That being our ideal of nationality it is almost foolish for anyone to think that if the Indian people grow into a nation the minority shall go to the wall; if the Indian people grow into a nation it will not be a Hindu nation nor it will be a Mahomedan nation nor will it be a Christian nation. No, Sir, it will be a federated nation. We have had our own history, our position is unique in the world, our history has been unique in the world and in God's Providence, as I read this history and as I read the position, our destiny will be a unique destiny among the nations of the world. We shall work out in India the problem of the federation of the human race. And in working out this problem the Hindu, the Mahomedan and the Christian shall make their highest and best contribution to the common culture, first of the Indian nation and then through the Indian nation to the common culture of the wider, the universal life of humanity. And in this work my young Mahomedan friends you must join the Hindus and the Hindus must join you; because let us remember this that our interests have been indissolubly bound up together by God. You belong to this land, our weal is your weal, our ill is your ill (Hear hear); our weakness is your weakness, your weakness is our weakness and in our strength, you shall grow strong and in your strength, we shall grow strong (cheers) and in our mutual combination and strength we shall be able to solve the most complex problems of Indian civilization and Indian politics far more easily and with the least disturbance to the present order than our enemies desire us or wish us to do. (Prolonged cheers and loud shouts *Vande Mataram.*)

"National Education."

(Sixth Lecture.)

Mr. Pal continuing his address on the above subject on Thursday evening last, said:—

The next question is, 'Is the education that we received, that we have been receiving for the last 50 years and more, the education that has been established in this country by the present alien Government, is that education conducted along National lines?' (Cries of no, no.) No! Why not, because those who control and direct this education are not competent to direct it along our National lines. (Cheers.) Even if they desire it they have not the adequate knowledge for doing it. They may translate our ancient scriptures and they may win the reputation of being superior orientalists by translating a chapter of the Ramayana or one or two *Sutras* of the Vedanta, but a study of Sanskrit grammar or translation of a few sutras of the Vedanta or a few chapters of the *Nyaya* does not entitle a foreigner to get into the spirit of the consciousness of our race, and as foreigners having a different cast of mind, having different traditions, having had a different training, the foreign Government and those whom that foreign Government imports from its own country are utterly unfit to guide and control education in India along National lines. No man knew more intimately of India than did the late Professor Max Muller, and yet when an Indian reads the voluminous works of Max Muller what does he find. He finds there that at every step the great orientalist has translated the words but has failed to convey the meaning. When I first read his translation of *Dharmapada*, the great Buddhist scripture, I read it

comparing it with the original; and even without any intimate acquaintance with *Pali*, a man who knows a little of Sanskrit and Prakrati, as these Prakratis are found in Sanskrit may help understand Pali scriptures. I was reading Dharmapáda and I took Max Muller for help, and what did I find? On the very first page I found there one word in Dharmapada which is a significant word describing the discipline of Buddhism. There is used this word *Nirudha Veerya*; I needed no translation to understand what it means,—holding of the *Veerya, Sutra Dharma, Brahma Charya*. These are all common things in our country. *Nirudha Veerya*. I looked in to Max Muller. What did I find? He says it means strong, Sandow is a strong man, but can the qualification of *Nirudha Veerya* be applied to Sandow. Now, this is just the sort of insight that we find into our literature, our thought, our life, our habits, our custom, our culture and our civilisation in the oriental scholars. And if Max Muller could go no further in *Nirudha Veerya* than Sandow's strength, how can you expect a raw graduate or for the matter of that, ripe graduate from Oxford or Cambridge coming out to India and directing Indian education along Indian National lines. No, Sir. The present Government stands incapacitated, because it is a foreign Government directing the education of the people along National lines. And what is the sort of education that you have been receiving all these years. It has had precious little reference to your own life, to the actualities of your own National history, not even had it any reference. An attempt is being made now only recently. It had very little reference even to your physical surroundings. You would learn Botany by British specimens and not by Indian specimens. Indian Botany is of recent growth, if it has grown at all. Even now in your books you learn words, but the things that these words signify are more or less absolutely absent from your actual life and environments. In the days when I was a

boy we read many excellent things. The smell of hay is sweet. And every Indian boy wonders why should, of all things on earth, the smell of hay be sweet. He does not know what hay is, and the teacher, at least my teacher did it, he said it was straw, and when going through a straw field in December or January, I have tried to smell the roots of dried straw to see what sweetness there was in it. Gradually the revelation came to me (laughter) that the sweetness was not to be found by human nose, but the Britisher being represented by John Bull, race of Bulls, naturally must have some perception of sweetness in straw. (Laughter.) I read, as some of you must have read also, of the swallow, my fourteen generations upward have never seen and I believe my 14 generations down shall never see swallow unless they go to England like me. And yet I have learnt swallow, swallow, swallow to swallow the whole without getting any idea whether it was a big thing or a small thing, whether it was white, brown or black, and what was its formation and what was its colour. Sometimes they give us pictures of swallow and other things, but what physiologist is there who teaches physiology to his students from physiological charts. They are helpful to a certain extent as mnemonics, with a view to revive the memory of things that have not been seen in their original actualities. The education that you have been receiving all these years has been shallow and because of this fact, namely, that this education has been verbal education, it had no reference to things but words. It helped to develop our memory but never our sense or our understanding as it ought to have done. And the result is not only we have suffered in intellectual life, but we have suffered in our ethical, our artistic and our spiritual life as well. Our character has grown on foreign tubs,' not even in tubs but in orchids, our manhood has been hung up on

the veranda having no roots in the actualities of our nation and our life in the past traditions of our race, we have grown like orchids— orchids grown on the veranda of European Government. That is what our education had been and the greatest pity of it is this, that it has divorced our minds, our heart, our spirit our character, and our manhood from our National life. We have been taught to botanise the oak, to botanise the elm, to botanise the beech to the neglect of our banyan, our mango groves, our chanpaka tree, to the neglect of the flora of our own country. We have been taught to investigate into the habits and customs of foreign animals and birds and this teaching has blinded our eyes to the beauties of the ornithological kingdom in India. Our birds that resound in the morning in mango groves with their thousand notes, do not form any part of our intellectual life. The grass covered fields, the paddy fields, the mango groves, the flowering chanpakas, asoka, the flowering vakula, all these things do not awaken in us any intellectual, do not create in us any intellectual quickening or emotional movement, because from our childhood onwards we have lived apart from these actualities of our life.

Open an English text book and what do you find there? Those text books are not meant for you, they were made for European, English boys and they described the surroundings in the midst of which the English boy lives and grows and therefore from his infancy onwards every English boy is placed in vital contact with his own surroundings, with his social surroundings, with his National life. Why, on account of this outlandish education, you are divorced from your actual surroundings and your actual National life. Partriotism has suffered in India in the past on account of this divorce between education and National

life. There has been patriotism in India among the educated classes of a type, I admit. In the days of my youth we also dreamt divine dreams in regard to the glory of our country. We sang also then National songs, but this partriotism of 25 years ago was a airy, fairy something, absolutely unrelated to the reality of our life and surroundings and this is due, this starvation of the patriotic sentiment in India, this weakening of civic aspiration in the people, this dependence upon the alien bureaucracy for the attainment of personal ambition or National advance ment—all this is due entirely to the outlandish, the rootless education that we have been receiving all these years. Since sometime past open attempts have commenced to be made by the Government to impart a particular kind of education in this country, an education that creates hot-house loyalty among the people of the land. (Cries of shame). Lord Curzon started University and educational reform with a view to the cultivation of loyalty to the present Government in India. Bishop Weldon, when the University reform was under discussion in India, writing to the London *Times* distinctly declared, and Bishop Weldon ought to know what was in the mind of his old classmate, the Viceroy of India in those days, that educational reforms were needed for the cultivation of loyal sentiments among the people of the country. Lee Warner's bible has been made a text book, specifically for these purposes and the recent circulars indicate what is the trend and tendency of the officialised system of education among us. This education was introduced by the English Government more than 50 years ago, specifically for their own benefit. English education was not introduced haphazard. So far as Bengal is concerned, we know that a great controversy arose between the supporters of English education and the advocates of oriental learning before English

Schools and Colleges were opened. Among those who advocated the introduction of English and western education was Lord Macaulay. There were others opposed to him who wanted to introduce the old, to reintroduce the old, oriental system of education. Their idea was to teach us Ghatathwa and Patathwa as I said once with a view to perpetuate our Dasathwa through Ghatathwa and Patathwa and once you devote yourself to Ghatakasa and Patakasa the political Akasa would be free of all disturbances. The orientalists wanted to confine our intellect and our mental activities to ancient logamatris. They wanted to keep the light of modern education and science away from this country and why, because they were afraid lest the Indian people, educated in Western science. educated in Western literature, brought up in Western history, might gradually demand to quote Lord Dufferin "to ride in the chariot of the sun" might be led to demand those free political institutions that are the most glorious heritage of Western nations. And Macaulay in reply to these forces declared that it would be a glorious day for England if the people of India, educated in Western science, brought up in Western history and literature, demanded those free political institutions for themselves in their country which exist in the land of their rulers. (Cheers.) And this declaration of Lord Macaulay was only an argument used against his opponents. It was not, Sir, as I read it, a declaration of original policy, should this thing happen then we shall enjoy the supreme satisfaction of having raised a fallen nation to such and such an object of National glory, not that we desire it to happen, but if the contingency should happen as your orientalists say, then this will be our consolation. The consloation, the consolation, twice will be the uplifting of a fallen nation. That is what Lord Macaulay's words meant and the policy that

guided Lord Macaulay was this. He saw that the British Government in India was a despotic Government and no despotic Government can exist in any country unless it is able to secure the support of the people of that country. Even Russian despotism depends for its continuance upon the support that it has been receiving from the royal duties and from those who are dependent on the royal duties in Russia. The despotism of the unspeakable Turk, as he is called, the hidden Turk, of the Sultan of Turkey, that is also an unmitigated despotism. It is supported by the Pasha. The power of the priest and the power of the aristocracy stand as a bulwark around the throne of the Sultan of Turkey protecting it from all insults from within and from without. Every student of political history knows that no despotism can exist anywhere unless it is able to create about itself a citadel of interest, popular interest, in the perpetuation of its own authority and the English Government in India having established itself as the supreme political authority in the country, looked about for the creation of such a citadel. It looked about and saw the native princes but they were unthinkable as a support of British rule which is established to the loss of their own power. They looked upon the middle classes, the real aristocracy of the country, the Brahman and the other higher castes. They had been to some extent greatest sufferers under the preceding administrations and the British policy saw in this middle class the possibilities of a bulwark that might be raised round itself for its own protection. English education was imparted with a view to create this bulwark. It had to be imparted, because the Government of such a large people could not be conducted by importing alien officers from their island home. Native agency had to be employed. It was essential that it should be employed and an agency had to be created, because the Government that these

foreigners established in this country was their own Government and not the Government of tbo people themselvss. The system was their own. English education had to be imparted, imparted with a view to raise up a class of men who would be able to serve the Government, that was one object. It had to be imparted, secondly, to create a class of men whose interests would be indissolubly bound up with the interests of the Government, which would receive their living from the hands of the Government as Government servants, who would receive honour and distinction from the Government, whose temporal interest would be bound up indissolubly with the Government, and more than that, if these people are trained in European history in English literature not only their temporal interests but their intellectual, their moral, their ethical ideal, nay even their civic ideal, may be bound with the perpetuation of the foreign authority in this country. Policy demanded that you should be educated in Western science and English literature, and for a long time the Government of India looked upon you as its greatest help and support. Until very recently, before a quarter of a century even, I might say, the Government in India looked upon the educated classes as those who would interpret their wishes to the people and stand between the people and the Government gaining theallegiance of the people for the Government and gaining the good offices of the Government or the people. That was the ideal even of British statesmen in India 25 years ago. The creation of an educated aristocracy so to say in India was thus of the Government in this country. But gradually you refused to discharge the functions which they wanted you to discharge, you claimed more than they thought you would even claim from them. Lord Dufferin said that you wanted to ride in the chariot of be sun and then gradually when you became restive, when you

became discontented, when you began, instead of helping to strengthen the authority of the Government, to place your self over the head of the people and set up a permanent opposition to that Government, the educational policy had to be changed, and it was changed. At first gradually, at first secretly, at first insidiously and then, as your opposition became violent and open the policy of the Government also became violent and open until in the last University Act, we find the culmination of that policy whose object is, has been, to curtail to some extent, in the name of depth of learning, an extensive cultivation of European literature and European art by our people. I have been told and I believe it is true, but, I speak open to correction, that Burke had been tabooed by the Calcutta University, the old books would be tabooed more and more, and in place of Burke you have Lee Warner's bible. (Laughter.) The time therefore has come when in the interests of the intellectual life of the nation, nay, more than that, in the interest of the preservation of the nation itself, you and I should take up the charge of educating people in our own hands, so that we may direct the mind of the nation, the will of the nation, the heart of the nation, the energy of the nation with a view to the realisation of the destiny of the nation. In the system of education that we propose to start in this country, liberal and scientific culture will be combined with technical education. In the system of education that we have formulated already in the National Council of Education in Bengal we have sought to combine scientific and liberal education with technical training. Whatever else might be done in other countries, in India it well be suicidal to set up wholly technics independently or apart from liberal and scientific training. We are essentially Sir, an intellectual race and we cannot sacrifice the intellectual life for the earning of bread. Man liveth not by bread alone. No, as I

said the other night, neither do nations live by bread alone and National destiny could not be realised by setting up soap factories or cotton mills. Indeed, even in the interest of the economic life of the nation, liberal and scientific education is essential, because what is technical education? Technical education is that education which helps a man to produce marketable commodities by the application of trained intelligence on the knowledge of the material that he possesses. In the application of trained intelligence to the knowledge of material for the production of marketable commodity, that is technical education, the intelligence must be trained for technical education and intelligence can only be trained by a liberal training, by a liberal culture, and knowledge of material must be gained for the purpose of technical education; and knowledge of material can only be gained by scientific education, because it is the science which gives you a knowledge of material, and technical education being the application of trained intelligence to knowledge of material for the production of marketable commodity, it is impossible to divorce this education from general, liberal and scientific culture. Therefore in our system of National education we had combined as compulsory branches in the lower school standards, liberal and scientific education with technical training up to 12 years of age. Up to the class which an ordinary boy may get to by the time he is 12 years, we teach no technical arts. It is the period which is devoted to the cultivation of the natural intelligence of the boy, of the development of his powers of understanding, to the development of his eye and hand, the training of his senses and of the imparting of ordinary knowledge of material for the training of the senses. From the 13th to 14th, two years this trained intelligence develops this knowledge of materially advancing and we teach him to apply this intelli-

gence to the knowledge of material that he gains during these two periods by a specific scientific culture for the production of some marketable commodity and this goes on advancing from step to step. For instance, let us represent the degree of; intelligence that a boy receives, attains when he is 14 years old, by *a*, let us represent the knowledge of material that an average boy gets in the class where a boy of 14 may get to in our colleges or school by *b*; *a* applied to *b* will produce the commodity *c*. In the next year his intelligence grows let us indicate the growth of this intelligence by *a* raised to the power of 1. His knowledge of experience as *b* raised to the power of 1 and the commodity that he produces also *c* raised to the power of 1. In the next year it will be *a* raised to the power of 2, *b* raised to the power of 2, and a corresponding improvement in the commodity, *c* raised to power of 2 and in this way we go up to the end of our school career and if the school career is finished, when the young man goes to the National College there are three branches. One is the general liberal branch whererin he is taught language, history, philosophy, arts. All these things are taught in one branch. There is a middle branch wherein pure science is taught. There is a third branch wherein higher technical studies are encouraged and held for the production of higher kinds of materials and commodities. Those who have not to earn a living, sons of rich men, men with independence, they may go in for pure literary or humanitarian studies. Those who, though not rich, desire to devote themselves to literary work may go in to that and devote themselves exclusively to the cultivation of the arts. In this department we shall train up others, historians, philosophers, poets, journalists, painters, sculptors, artists. Then in the middle branch of science pure, our aim shall be to produce men of science who shall devote them

selves to original scientific investigation, men the of type of Jagadees Chandra Bhose, or Prabhulla Chandra Bhose, and in the third branch there will be men who will apply the principles of science as attained by the researches of the scientific students and savants for the production of ordinary commodity. This Sir, briefly is the sketch of the system of National education that we propose to impart in our National Schools and Colleges in Bengal. We have already a number of schools, one in Rungpur, one in Dinajpur, one in Dacca, two in the Mymensingh District, two in Comilla District, one in Jalpaigiri and a school and college in Calcutta. The income from endowed funds of the National Council of which I have the honour to be a member is just now Rs. 60,000. It is not a large sum for a National University, but we hope, in course of time as we are able to prove by results the superiority of the education that we seek to impart to our youths, funds will be forthcoming.

We have got now 2,500 to 3,000 students reading in our different colleges and schools. (Cheers.) It is not a large number and yet we are not disheartened because we are working against great odds. This present system of education, officialised education, has created a hankering in the people for the Government service and the so called learned professions and the education that we offer can hold out no temptations in those lines. (Hear, hear and cheers.) Our certificates of degrees will not help any one to get into the Government service. (Cheers.) I shall be sorry, Sir, if at any time it is regarded as a passport of Government service until the Government becomes our own (cheers). We may teach law, we have not started any legal faculty as yet, but our legal degrees will not entitle one to plead before these foreign Law Courts (Cheers.) We are working against great odds, but still we are thankful for these 3,000 students. There were not as many when they first started

English education in this country and I believe, Sir, that in proportion as the repressive measures of the present Government advances and persecution is started against the student population and an attempt is made to stifle their new-born love for the motherland (cheers), in proportion as this is done, in proportion as an alternative that the officialised institutions will place before the people, becomes this, either to serve the mother land (cheers) or to attain a livelihood by following the service of the foreign Government; in proportion as this is done, in that proportion, I believe, with the help of God, the enthusiasm for National education will increase (shouts of *Vande Mataram*) and both guardians and boys, as they are doing in Bengal, will in every part of India consider it their sacred duty to give their go-by to the officialised educational institutions and the chances of earning a livelihood by slaving under this Government and take to National education (cheers); and this much, I can assure you, my dear friends, that whoever will come to our schools and colleges will have a greater chance of earning a decent livelihood than what is offered by the present officialised University. (Cheers.) How many of those, I say, who are sent to school by their parents with a view to pass their examinations, and passing their examinations, to get into some honourable post under the Government, how many, what percentage of those do attain their goal? (A voice 5 per cent.) Yes. Out of every 100, five or six at the utmost (cries of yes, yes). A number fall off at the matriculation and they cannot go further; a number fall off at the F.A. and they cannot go to the B.A.; again a number fall off at the law degree and they cannot pass and it is just like the *Mahaprayana* of the Pandavas and ultimately the *Yudhishtira* reaches the position of a Deputy Magistrate. That is what becomes and the boy that falls upon the way, the young man that falls off at the Matric, at the F.A., the young man that is

expelled from the gate of the B.A., what are they worth? What can they earn? (A voice Rs. 7-8-0 another Rs. 10.) (Laughter and cheers). In Madras a B.A., as I understand, earns on an average Rs. 15 or Rs. 20 a month (cries of shame and not even that.) I am glad to learn that it is true, because if you realise that truth of it the temptation to follow this University will not be so strong as it otherwise might have been and what we can offer for you in our education, you must have seen from this brief sketch that I have given you, all prizes, no blanks. (Cheers.) Ours will not be merely an examining body. We to some extent are an examining body, but it is due to an example set by the University. If we are left to ourselves, we would not be an examining body, but we would be a teaching body (hear, hear); and gradually I hope that these Universities rather filled to their utmost capacity by the son of Tahsildars and Deputy Magistrates and other Government servants (laughter and cheers) the general population leaving it altogether. When that day comes, as I hope it will be, we shall be able also to considerably modify our present examination system in the National University. But, as I said, our system offers all prizes and no blanks; because the boy that leaves our National Schools at the age of 14 is good for doing something, perhaps he can turn out some work as a carpenter, as a blacksmith, as a goldsmith, as a weaver, something he can turn his hand to; we take care to teach every boy that which he is best fitted to learn, we teach every boy something, be he the son of a Zemindar or a peasant. Compulsory technical education in the school department (hear, hear) he must have if not for earning bread, at least as a part of the general liberal culture, because making of things is regarded now by moderate Pedagogues in America and other places as part of the liberal education of every boy. Therefore whoever goes out of school

will have learnt something from us by which he can earn something say 15 to 20, if he cannot earn more, but will have the consolation, the supreme satisfaction of feeling that he is a free man and independent man. If he cannot provide himself and his family with luxurious food he will at least have the satisfaction of dining upon his rice and *rasam* or *charu*, but consistently with the preservation of his self-respect. (Hear, hear and cheers) This, then, is the sort of education that we have schemed in our National University This is the ideal of the realisation of the National destiny; and my last word to you is this. Unless you accept this ideal of National education and not only accept it intellectually but unless you make a strong realisation, the rich to lay out their money, those who have not money to place their boys and their youths for tuition in these schools and the general public to offer the best that they can towards the furtherance of this object, unless you do it, the time is come when all this new spirit will fail to attain its purpose because of the repressive measures that are being introduced in the Educational Department of India by that Government. (Cries of shame.) The recent circular, I do not know what effect it will have upon the conscience and consciousness of thepeople in Madras. (Cries of It will have.) Need I say that henceforth it will not be possible not only for our school boys, but it will be difficult, if not impossible for our teachers and professors and the educated community in general to participate in the present National upheaval. Why, Sir, why should politics be *tabooed* from our University and our schools. Do they do it in England? (Cries of no, no.) Is politics condemned even in the public schools of England; in the Universities do they not discuss patriotic and academical problems, but actually deal with the burning political questions of the day. In the Oxford and Cambridge unions they discuss politics and in the

schools they bring up boy brigades, do they not sing the National Anthem in the public schools in England, Rule Britannia rules the waves, Britain shall never be slaves, is it tabooed in any public school in England, and if not, how can you say that the singing of *Bande Mataram* is not consistent with the advancement of real culture and education among the people of this country. (Shouts of *Bande Mataram.*) The Principal of a College in Madras, it is reported, wanted to amend the objects of Young Men's Association which declared that the cultivation of the patriotic sentiment was its end and aim and he wanted to amend it. Cultivation of the patriotic sentiment consistently with loyalty to the prese. Government, would it be impossible, would it be thought of o would it be dreamt in any part of England. (Cries of no, no) Patriotism in an absolute virtue and if it is to be limited by a consideration it is to be limited by a consideration of universal humanity and by no other consideration patriotic sentiment must be cultivated consistently with the cultivation of love for universal humanity. That is what one can understand. Therefore, it seems to me. Sir, that this new circular and the repressive measures that are presaged in this circular, all these will either kill National education, not in every Province, but in some Provinces. (Cries of " not in Madras".) I thank you; but it will, I hope, it will not be able to kill it; on the contrary it seems to me tha this circular of the Government of India well help the growth c National education (cheers) and I hope and trust the ne patriotism and public spirit of Madras (shouts of *Bande Matara* will give a practical reply to this circular by organising now a at once a National College and School here. (Shouts of *Ba Mataram.*) If this is done, you will solve the problem of educat in India such as it is not as yet been solved by the British co trolled Universities and officialised agencies of public instru in this country. (Loud shouts of *Bande Mataram* and prolo cheers.)

ighest awards.

7 Gold, 9 Silver and other Medals, Diplomas &c.

TRUE SWADESI PERFUMES.

UNDER THE DISTINGUISHED PATRONAGE

OF

SEVERAL RULING CHIEFS AND PRINCES.

Highly commended by 40 Journals all over India.

The Kaisar Soap & Perfumery Factory.

Cawnpore.

Under the able supervision

OF

Gopal Ch. Bannerjee, F. C. S. & M. A. S.,

LONDON.

Triple Extracts, Perfumes, Attars, Scented Toilet ;oaps, Bathing Hair oils, Scents for Handkerchiefs, for ;andal, Rose Water, etc., etc.

Manufactured by improved process of highest Purity ;iving aroma of fresh flowers, Sweet Delicate and ,asting.

Compare favourably with the imported goods.

PRICES TO SUIT ALL POCKETS.

Wholesale Agents,

GANESH & Co.,

MADRAS.

WHAT THE EMINENT SONS OF INDIA SAY

The Hon. Justice G. M. Ranade, M.A.,L.L.B.,C.I.E.:—

The worth of the oil will be more generally appreciated by all classes of people who suffer from baldness and headache.

Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose:—

It keeps the head cool. I can safely recommend it to all who want a really excellent hair oil.

The Hon. Babu Surendranath Banerjee:—

In point of coolness and fragrance, it is the best oil I have used.

Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, M.A.,C I.E:—

It is sweet-scented and efficacious and has a cooling effect on the brain.

Mr. D. E. Wacha:—

I have pleasure in testifving to the excellence of Jabakusum Taila, which possesses good cooling qualities and contributes, not a little, to a rich growth of hair.

The Hon. Gopal Krishna Gokhale, C.I.E.:—

Jabakusum Taila is cooling and refreshing.

The Hon. Sir V. C. Des chariar Avl.:—

I have been using Jabaku Taila with the result that I l given up using any other oil.

The Hon. P. Ananda Ch C.I.E.:—

Jabakusum Taila is an exce hair tonic. I recommend it t my countrymen.

The Hon. M. Sreenivasa Avl.:—

A splendid oil for the hair

Dewan Bahadur R. Raghun Row Avl.:—

The Jabakusum Taila cools head, cures headache, and pleasant to use

Dr. S. V. Ramasawmi Iyen M.D., M.B., C.M., L.R.C.P. & L.E.P., Oculist, Mys Government.—

Very pleasant to keep the h and eyes cool.

A. K. Yagnanarayana Iyer, Chemist, Mysore Governmen

It is the most agreeable fumed oil and promotes growth of the hair.

To cool the over-worked brain, to help concentration, to streng the intellectual power, to cheer the spirit, and for removing bald prematurely turning grey and falling off of hair, there is nothing equ our celestial toilet perfume, Jabakusum Taila. Ever housed where gets possession.

Chief Agents,

GANESH & Co.,

MADRAS.